

THE  
MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 2.

AUGUST, 1890.

No. 5.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

THE BOOK OF JONAH: IS IT FACT OR FICTION?

BY REV. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D., OF THE COLLEGIATE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY.

THE old method of explaining the story of Jonah by a comparison with heathen fables is now out of date. The myth that Perseus rescued Andromeda by slaying the sea monster to whom she was exposed, and the similar tale that Hercules delivered Hesione, who was confronted with the same danger, by leaping into the jaws of the monster and tearing out its entrails, are admitted now to have no connection with a Hebrew narrative composed long before the earliest date assigned to these classical stories. Indeed, they are so different in tone and texture and ethical purport that only a wild imagination can dream that all three belong to the same category.

But at the present time the question has taken a new shape. It is no longer between believers and unbelievers, or supernaturalists and rationalists, or the learned and the ignorant. But devout scholars of high repute for attainments and character, who equally recognize the divine authority of the written Word, differ very widely as to the way in which the Book of Jonah is to be regarded. Some accept the common opinion of the Church at large that it is strictly historical, and is a faithful narrative of actual occurrences. Others affirm that it is an imaginative composition, not intended to be understood literally, but written with a didactic purpose, like the parables of our Lord, or the vision related to King Ahab by Micaiah, the son of Imlah (1 Kings xxii. 19-23). Professor Briggs ("Biblical Study," pp. 238-39) does not positively pronounce Jonah to be a fiction, but strenuously insists that if it were there would be no loss. Speaking of this book and Esther he says, "The model of patriotic devotion, the lesson of the universality of divine providence and grace, would be still as forcible, and the gain would be at least equal to the loss,

if they were to be regarded as inspired ideals rather than inspired statements of the real. The sign of the Prophet Jonah as a symbol of the resurrection of Jesus Christ is as forcible, if the symbol has an ideal basis, as if it had an historical basis." To the same effect Professor Bruce says ("The Chief End of Revelation," p. 221), "On similar grounds we can regard with equanimity critical discussions respecting the literary character of such a book as that of the Prophet Jonah. Whether it be history, or whether it be parable, that book bears witness to the catholicity of divine grace, and in performing that important canonical function, it fully vindicates its title to a place in the literature of revelation." Still more plain is the language of Professor G. P. Fisher, of Yale University, in his admirable article in the *Century* for January last, on the nature and method of Revelation. After mentioning the hatred of pious Israelites toward the abominations of paganism, which awakened a desire for the divine vengeance to fall upon heathen worshippers, he proceeds (pp. 463-64), "An impressive rebuke of this unmerciful sentiment, and what is really a distinct advance in the inculcation of an opposite feeling is found in the Book of Jonah. There are reasons which have availed to satisfy critics as learned and impartial as Bleek, who are influenced by no prejudice against miracles as such, that this remarkable book was originally meant to be an apologue—an imaginary story, linked to the name of an historical person, a prophet of an earlier date, and was composed in order to inculcate the lesson with which the narrative concludes. This was the opinion also of the late Dr. T. D. Woolsey. One thing brought out by the experience of Jonah is that, so great is God's mercy that even an explicit threat of

dire calamities may be left unfulfilled in case there intervene repentance on the part of those against whom it was directed. The prophet who was exasperated at the sparing of the Ninevites was taught how narrow and cruel his ideas were, by the symbol of the gourd 'which came up in a night and perished in a night.' He was incensed on account of the withering of the gourd which had shielded his head from the sun. The Lord referred to Jonah's having had pity on the gourd, and said: 'And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?' This humane utterance, in which compassion is expressed even for the dumb brutes, is memorable for being one of the most important landmarks in Scripture, since it marks a widened view of God's love to the heathen. To illustrate this truth the narrative was written, and toward it as onward to a goal it steadily moves."\*

The same ground is taken by Dr. Charles H. H. Wright, author of several valuable exegetical works, in a volume of "Biblical Essays," issued in 1886. His view is that the book is an allegory, which he supports by a reference to the fourth chapter of Galatians in which the Apostle Paul cites the account given in Genesis of Abraham's two sons, one by the handmaid and one by the free-woman, and then adds "which things contain an allegory." But the allegory here instead of excluding presupposes the historical sense. Dr. Wright holds that the book is an allegorical description of Israel's past and a prophecy of Israel's future. He explains the meaning of the great fish by such phrases as Isaiah's (xxvii. 1) "He shall slay the sea-monster which is in the sea," *i.e.*, the world-power opposed to God and His people, and Jeremiah's (li. 34) "The King of Babylon hath devoured me . . . he hath swallowed me up like the sea-monster, he hath filled his maw with my delicacies," and still further the words of Jehovah (li. 44) "I will do judgment upon Bel in Babylon, and I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he

hath swallowed up." To these passages is to be added the saying of Hosea (vi. 2), "After two days will He revive us: on the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live before Him." On the basis of these hints Dr. Wright thinks that the story was constructed in order to meet the case of Israel when restored to their own land. They expected that the judgments upon the heathen world foretold in the prophets would be at once executed, and since they were not, they were greatly disappointed. It was not enough that the covenant people were brought back, their enemies and God's needed to be signally overthrown, and since, on the contrary, they were great and flourishing, while Israel was weak and in subjection, they became gloomy and depressed. Now the writer of the Book of Jonah made his narrative to suit the case. First the huge fish swallows the prophet who represented his people; his entombment continues three days. Then he is suddenly extricated, alive and whole. He proceeds on an errand of mercy to the great heathen capital of which the fish was a symbol, and that errand is successful. Here, then, is exhibited anew and in a very striking form the extent of the divine compassion and the truth that God's denunciations of wrath against any nation are conditioned on the continuance in evil of the nation especially threatened. The ruin of kingdoms announced by any prophet might be averted by their repentance. Jeremiah expressly states this (xviii. 7, 8) "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, to pluck up and to destroy it; if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." This great principle is emphasized in Jonah because his unwillingness to execute the commission with which he was entrusted was due to the conviction he cherished in his innermost soul that God was "gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy" (Jonah iv. 2). He considered it quite possible that God might repent of the evil He designed to do, and that his message delivered in Nineveh might be the very means of awakening the repentance which would avert the threatened doom. It is not strange, therefore, that this result when it did occur greatly surprised him. His prophecy was apparently a failure, and the heathen enjoyed a wonderful exhibition of the divine favor. This was admirably adapted to correct the views of the exiles who returned from Babylon. For though restored they were still under the Gentile yoke. Their bodies,

\* One's confidence in Professor Fisher's critical acumen is shaken by his remark (p. 462) on the supposed fact that the less instructed Hebrews imagined that there was some sort of a territorial limit to the jurisdiction of the God whom they worshipped. "An indistinct idea of this kind is at least a natural explanation of the attempted flight of the Prophet Jonah to Tarshish which lay on the western border of the Mediterranean." We believe that all modern critics are agreed that the phrase (i. 3) "to flee from the presence of the Lord" does not mean at all that the prophet hoped to escape Jehovah's omniscient eye, but that he fled from being in the presence of the Lord as His servant and minister. It was a formal renunciation of his office. Weak as Jonah was, he could not possibly have regarded "the God of heaven, which hath made the sea and the dry land" (i. 9) as a local deity.

their cattle, and their goods were in the power of their enemies, and they were consequently in great distress (Neh. ix. 36-37). It was quite natural for them to scan eagerly the horizon in order to discover any one who would bring them news of the great overthrow which they had been taught to expect and which they eagerly wished. The allegory also represents one of their expectations and its disappointment. This was the hope excited by Haggai's promise to Zerubbabel that followed immediately upon the prediction of a great shaking of the heavens and the earth. "In that day, saith Jehovah of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, the son of Shealtiel, saith Jehovah, and will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee" (ii. 23). The Jews expected that their governor would soon be manifested not as a mere Persian viceroy, but as the Anointed of Jehovah; that the government would be upon His shoulder; and that they would indeed sit down under His shadow with great delight, and His fruit be sweet to their taste (Cant. ii. 3). But this expectation was not realized. Zerubbabel, although he was a lineal descendant of David and a man of many excellences, soon passed away. Whether he died in exile or in the city of his fathers, we know not, but his viceroyalty was short. The gourd or palmchrist, on which the Jews had fixed their hopes, and which for a time shadowed and sheltered them, was destroyed. It perished, as it were, in a night. The worm did the work of destruction. And after that the house of David sank for centuries into utter insignificance.

Dr. Wright thinks that the reference of our Lord to Jonah can be fully justified even if the ground be taken that the book was an allegory or symbolical prophecy. For Messiah and the people of Israel are so closely connected together that the prophecies which relate to the one refer more or less directly to the other. Messiah and Israel are both termed "the servant of Jehovah," the one in the higher, the other in a lower, sense of the phrase (cf. Isa. xlii. 1 and 19). The events which happened to the people of Israel in the infancy of the nation find a counterpart in the history of Israel's king. The world-power sought to destroy both in infancy (Ex. i. 15-22; Matt. ii. 16); they were both driven into Egypt for temporary deliverance from danger (Gen. xlv. 7-11; Matt. ii. 13-15); and after a season were called forth out of that land (cf. Hos. xi. 1 with Matt. ii. 15). It is hence inferred that a prophetic allegory, depicting the temporary death of

the nation and its resurrection anew to a national existence, might therefore very properly be referred to as containing a prophecy of the death and resurrection of Israel's Lord and king.

We have thus endeavored to give a faithful outline of Dr. Wright's view, using largely his own words, and it is fair to presume that the work of so learned and devout a scholar presents that side of the question as fully and strongly as any of its advocates could desire.\* But before considering his theory it may be well to look at the objections he makes to the acceptance of the book as actual history. One is that if the framers of the Canon of the Old Testament had so regarded it, they would scarcely have inserted it in its present position among the prophetic, instead of with the historical books. It is hard to see the force of this reason. The book does not have the usual character of histories which are anonymous (Judges, Ruth, Samuel, etc.), but after the regular manner of prophecies begins with the customary identification of the author, "the Word of the Lord came unto Jonah." And to this is prefixed the word "And" [in A. V., *Now*], thus joining it on to the other prophetic writings, in the midst of which it is found. It records the experience of a prophet in the discharge of his official duty, and as such was surely entitled to the place it occupies, whether interpreted literally or symbolically. So far as we can judge from the usual methods of those who compiled the Canon they had no option but to put it where we find it.

Again, it is said that "if the incidents mentioned in the book were historical, it is more than strange that no allusion is made to any one of them in the Books of the Kings and the Chronicles." The argument *e silentio* is always a precarious one, because we know not all the circumstances of the case. Dr. Wright says that no prophet was ever despatched on a grander or more important mission than Jonah, and the outcome, if the narrative be regarded as history, was a wonderful success. When compared with the result of Jonah's preaching, Elijah's controversy with Israel on Mount Carmel sinks into utter insignificance.

\* I have not quoted Dr. Wright's reference to the parable of the Prodigal Son, because that parable does not treat of Jews compared with Gentiles but (as Luke xv. 1, 2 shows) of Pharisees compared with publicans and sinners, and because the whole narrative of the eldest son is mere costume, designed to set off and enhance the ground of the father's compassion, but having no independent signification of its own, and having no counterpart in actual life either when the exquisite parable was delivered or at any period since, any more than there are now or ever have been "ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance."

"Why, then, should the latter incident have been recorded in the Second Book of Kings (chap. xviii.), while the most extraordinary fact connected with a prophet is passed over in silence?" This question is by no means unanswerable. Elijah's dealing at Mount Carmel was a constituent part of the miraculous procedures intended through the agency of him and his successor Elisha to arrest the dreadful apostasy introduced by Ahab. That apostasy was not simply, like previous backslidings, the worship of God by idols, but an absolute dethronement of Jehovah and the putting of Baal in his place. To overcome this great evil and recover the nation back to its ancient faith there was an unusual display of supernatural power, and it was successful. The people swung back to their former moorings, and Baal worship was suppressed. These proceedings were part and parcel of the national history, and they needed to be recorded if that history was to be complete. The experience of Jonah, on the contrary, was an episode, bearing no relation to the ordinary stream of events, an object-lesson on some principles of the divine nature and government, and therefore not requiring to be noticed by the historian or annalist. The author of the Book of Kings (2 Kings xiv. 25) recorded Jonah's prediction of the recovery of the lost provinces of Israel because it indicated the divine hand in the prosperous reign of the great Jeroboam II., and he omitted to mention the prophet's expedition to Nineveh because it had no bearing upon the course of things inside the commonwealth of Israel.

Precisely the same objection may be made to the Book of Ruth. Her name and history are not mentioned or even alluded to in the Old Testament. Shall we then say that this touching story which Goethe pronounced to be "the loveliest thing in the shape of an epic or an idyl which has come down to us" is not a narrative of facts, but simply a pastoral story composed for moral and didactic purposes?

Another objection is drawn from the prayer of Jonah recorded in the second chapter of his prophecy. This is said to be a cento of passages taken chiefly from the Psalms, many of which were composed during the exile (iii. 8; xviii. 4, 5, 6; xvi. 10; xxx. 3; xxxi. 6, 22; xlii. 7; lxxviii. 6, 7; lxix. 1, 2, 5; cxvi. 17; cxix. 55; cxx. 1; cxlii. 3).

It must be admitted that the resemblance between Jonah's language and that of the Scriptures referred to is real and not imaginary, yet he is not a mere copyist. If he

were, it would make against the allegorical theory, for why could not the genius who conceived and executed such a marvellous composition, showing such a creative imagination and such a power of condensation, have expressed the sentiments proper to the occasion in words of his own? Whereas on the literal interpretation it is reasonable to suppose that Jonah's mind being stored with the lyrics used in public worship, he naturally used these consecrated words and phrases in uttering his feelings. When it is said that the Psalms used were written in view of or at the time of the captivity, one doubtful hypothesis is sustained by another equally doubtful. The only compositions of certainly late date that are said to be borrowed from are cxvi. 17 and cxx. 1. The former has,

I will offer to Thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving,  
And will call upon the name of the LORD.

I will pay my vows unto the LORD,  
Yea, in the presence of all His people.

The words of Jonah are (verse 9)

But I will sacrifice unto Thee with the voice of  
thanksgiving;

I will pay that which I have vowed.

But is it necessary to suppose that the terms of such a commonplace statement were borrowed by the prophet? The same question may be asked with still more point in regard to the opening words of the prayer,

I called by reason of mine affliction unto the LORD,  
And He answered me,

which are said to have been taken from the second of the Psalms cited above, viz. :

In my distress I cried unto the LORD,  
And He answered me.

Could not such an utterance be made independently by two writers, without either leaning upon the other?

It is further said of the prayer that not a single note of repentance is struck from first to last. It contains no lamentation for sin. It is not such a hymn as could have been naturally composed under the circumstances, if those circumstances be regarded as literal facts. Nor is it such a hymn as one would think that a man rescued from the stomach of an actual sea-monster would compose as a memorial of his deliverance. In reply it may be said that the objection fails to consider the exact circumstances of the case, and the purport of the composition. Certainly the terms and phrases employed are well adapted to set forth after the Hebrew fashion the conceptions of a man drowned in the open sea.



It is his rescue from this hopeless condition that he celebrates, and not from the imprisonment in the fish's belly, for the latter was a token of favor and the means of his preservation. What he dwells on is that he had sunk down to the roots of the mountains, his head wrapped in the seaweed and the solid bars of the earth around him forever, and yet Jehovah, his God, had delivered him from the desperate entanglement. This absorbs his mind. There is no confession of sin, but there is no assertion of righteousness (as in Ps. xviii. 20-24 and elsewhere); there are no words of repentance, but is not this implied in his calling upon Jehovah, and his turning again, though cut off and cast out, toward God's holy temple? And is it anything marvellous if the consciousness of forgiveness assured by his rescue so filled his mind with the sense of gratitude that this alone was the burden of his utterance unto the Lord? Besides, the argument may be turned against its proposers, and we may ask, if this narrative were an apologue composed by some sacred scholar in his retirement, would he not have been careful to insert a proper expression of the prophet's sin? The omission of such an utterance, therefore, makes for the historical character of the book. At the same time it is noteworthy that while Jonah's sin is clearly set forth no remarks are made upon the subject. Even at the close of the proceeding, when the prophet displayed his miserable petulance so strikingly, all the reproof uttered is simply a question, "Dost thou well to be angry?" The design was to use him and his narrow-minded bigotry as a foil in order to set forth the wondrous compassion of the Most High more effectively. Hence the absence of penitential confessions in Jonah's prayer is no argument against the real occurrence of the strange rescue that called forth his gratitude and praise.

Again, it is said that, considering the size and importance of Nineveh and the minute and well-developed system of idolatry that prevailed there, it is incredible that such a change should so suddenly have been produced by the outcry of a single man, and no record of it made in the monuments that remain. The answer is that extensive and thorough as is our acquaintance with the history and literature of ancient Egypt, there has yet to be found any trace of the ten plagues inflicted through Moses or of the catastrophe at the Red Sea. The lacuna in the Nile Valley explains the lacuna on the Tigris. Besides, it is not said that the Ninevites were spiritually converted, or that they dethroned their idols,

or that they worshipped the Jehovah of the Hebrews. All these things may have taken place, but they are not necessarily involved in the view that the narrative is historical. All that the book says is that the people one and all repented, turned from their evil ways, especially "the violence that was in their hands," and instituted a universal fast accompanied with a fervent cry unto God, *i.e.*, the God whose announcement had struck them with terror. It was more an ethical than a religious movement. Now there is on record the case of an individual which for ought we know may present exactly what occurred at Nineveh. Elijah was sent to Ahab with a prediction of dreadful evil upon him because he sold himself to work evil in the sight of the Lord, whereupon the king rent his clothes and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted, and went softly (1 Kings xxi. 27). There is not much reason to consider this exercise of Ahab a deep-seated and spiritual one such as is described in Ps. xxxii. and li., especially when one remembers his conduct and his death, as described in the next chapter, yet Jehovah was pleased to accept it, and accordingly he said to Elijah, "Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days, but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house." What is to hinder us from thinking that the humiliation and fasting and reformation of the Ninevites procured for them just what Ahab's humiliation procured for him, *i.e.*, not a reversal of the sentence, but a suspension of it, so that it was not inflicted upon him, but upon another generation? This agrees with all the facts in the case. Nineveh was overthrown, and the predictions of Israel's prophets were literally accomplished, but it was more than a century after Jonah's time. The mission of the disobedient prophet was effectual. It accomplished its purpose. It spared more than sixscore thousand people for several generations, and exhibited in the most striking manner the mercy and forbearance of the Most High.

As to the language of the book, it has been claimed that there are words used which distinctly show that it was composed at a late period when the language received a Chaldaizing element. But Dr. Pusey in his commentary has shown that all or nearly all the words specified are Hebrew or from a Hebrew root, and that they are not used elsewhere because there was no occasion to use them, just as Luke, for the same reason, in recounting Paul's voyage to Rome,

employs a number of words not to be found in any other part of the New Testament. One peculiar word (*taam*) rendered "decree," which is not Hebrew but Aramaic, was doubtless the very term used in Nineveh to designate the ordinance of the king and nobles.

The notion that the book is a fiction seems to us not consonant with the ideas we are accustomed to cherish concerning divine revelation. As the late Dr. J. A. Alexander stated it, "The necessity of fiction to illustrate moral truth arises not from the deficiency of real facts adapted to the purpose, but from the writer's limited acquaintance with them, and his consequent incapacity to frame the necessary combinations without calling in the aid of his imagination. But no such necessity can exist in the case of an inspired, much less of an omniscient teacher. To resort to fiction, therefore, when real life affords in such abundance the required analogies, would be a gratuitous preference, if not of the false to the true, at least of the imaginary to the real which seems unworthy of our Lord, or which, to say the least, we have no room to assume without necessity" (Com. on Mark, p. 86). He thinks therefore that all our Saviour's parables are founded on fact, if not entirely composed of real incidents. But whether this be so or not, they are set forth as simply illustrations of moral or religious truth derived from the analogy of human experience. They do not pretend to be anything more than figurative statements or prolonged metaphors, and can in no case deceive.\* All hearers or readers at once penetrate beneath the surface, and see what is really meant. Take, for example, the parable of Dives and Lazarus. The rich man is represented as asking for water to cool his tongue, yet at that very time his body, as the parable says, was lying in the grave, and hence every one sees that these words are only a representation of mental anguish. The same is true of all the so-called apologues in the Old Testament. They bear their metaphorical meaning on their face. And this seems to have been the rule, and one in marked contrast with the customs of the Orientals, whose teachings abounded in fables, apologues, and allegories. Thus the extremely fine story of the way in which Abraham came to escape the idolatries of

the primeval world, which is referred to by Josephus and Philo, and given at length in the Talmud and the Koran, was doubtless extant when our Canon was formed if not long before, yet it was not inserted in the sacred text, simply because it was not true. Abraham might have said this, but there is no evidence that he did say it. Yet if it had been reproduced, it would have impressed the reader as the narrative of a fact.\*

And just here is the great objection to the view which regards Jonah as an ideal composition. Not a hint of anything of the kind is anywhere given in the prophecy. From first to last the book runs on like the narrative of a series of actual occurrences. Indeed, so plain and palpable is this that one is tempted to think that if it had not been for the abnormal entombment of the prophet in the belly of the fish, no one would ever have dreamed of taking it as an allegory. This seems to have staggered the faith of men, yet without reason. For to one who believes in God nothing in the shape of a miracle is incredible. One sign differs from another in its form and accompaniments, but substantially all stand upon the same footing, and are alike manifestations of Him to whom all things are possible. "There can be no scale of the miraculous. To Infinite Power it is no easier to pick up a pin than to stop all the planets in their courses for a time and then send them on again" (Reade). Nor is it for us to determine when, where, and how the miraculous shall be put forth. And, further, if the fish's swallowing Jonah is objectionable as a fact, why is it not equally so as an ideal narrative? If it shocks common sense in one case, why not in the other?

Again, the Book of Jonah, while of course it has, and must have, a moral aim, bears throughout the appearance of an historical narrative and has been so regarded for ages. It is thus referred to in Tobit xiv. 4, 8, 15, and by Josephus, Ant. 9, 10:2. In the Koran a chapter (the tenth) bears the prophet's name as a title, and in the thirty-seventh chapter there is a distinct recital of his experiences—that he fled, that he was cast overboard and swallowed by a fish, that he was vomited out, and that a gourd was made to grow up over him. There is

\* Are any words strong enough to express the difference between a transparent fiction like that of the parable of the Sower which every hearer detects at once as having a concealed meaning, and a narrative which has so much the appearance of actual history that for ages and generations it never enters the mind of a reader that it is anything else?

\* The story is thus given in the Koran: When night overshadowed him he saw a star and said, "This is my Lord." But when it set he said, "I like not those that set." And when he saw the moon rising he said, "This is my Lord." But when the moon set he answered, "Verily if my Lord direct me not in the right way I shall be as one of those that err." And when he saw the sun rising he said, "This is my Lord. This is greater than the star or the moon." But when the sun went down he said, "O my people, I am clear of these things. I turn my face to Him who hath made the heaven and the earth."

also in the twenty-first chapter distinct mention of him as the dweller in the fish and of his prayer in the darkness and of God's answer. Now the oracles of Mohammed are not quoted as authority, but they may justly be appealed to as witnesses to the prevailing manners and modes of thought among the Orientals, and as evidence that an occurrence which to Western tastes would be most unsuitable would exactly meet their needs and be in their view every way appropriate. The religious lesson of the narrative is wholly neglected by the Koran, but the miracle as an evidence of God's power and justice is duly emphasized. And what is there in the story that is justly objectionable to the people of any age or land? As far back as the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 21) we read

They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God;  
They have provoked me to anger with their vanities:

And I will move them to jealousy with those who are not a people;  
I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.

These words are quoted by the Apostle Paul (Rom. x. 19) to prove that Israel would be rejected for their sins and the Gentiles received to favor instead of them; and they had the same meaning at an older date. When Jonah was commissioned to go to Nineveh, he doubtless remembered these words of the Most High, and inferred that the substitution spoken of was about to take place, in consequence of which repentant Nineveh would become the people of God while the children of Abraham would be cast out. And this was insupportable. In any event the covenant people were no longer to be the exclusive recipients of divine revelation. Rather than be a party to any such proceeding Jonah would renounce his office and give up his home in Israel. God allows him to carry out his purpose so far as to embark for a heathen port, and then interposes with a fearful storm so persistent and increasing as to suggest supernatural agency. In the end he is cast overboard, but is miraculously preserved in a most wonderful way, whereupon his commission is renewed and he executes it with the result which he anticipated from the beginning. Nineveh repents and is spared. The prophet repines and mourns, and is rebuked by symbol and word, in the gourd which sheltered him and in the words of Jehovah, "Should not I have pity on that great city Nineveh?" Now we may well ask, If Jewish narrowness and bigotry were to be rebuked and God's boundless grace to

be set forth, how could these things be more effectually accomplished than by such a series of events as are here recorded? The objections made to the narrative as halting and incomplete are of no account, for all that is necessary for the instruction of the reader is given. What the special sins of Nineveh were, the name of the king then on the throne, the details of the prophet's journey, the subsequent fate of Jonah, are points not at all required to the author's aim. That aim is not simply to add a chapter to Israel's history or record what otherwise might be lost, but to set forth a divine disclosure made in a series of historical acts and words, and bearing upon a feature of God's character most likely at that period to be misconceived or denied.

But the decisive evidence in regard to Jonah is given by our Lord in words recorded by two of the evangelists (Matt. xii. 38-41; xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29-32). The people, or rather certain of the scribes and the Pharisees, came to him, seeking a sign from heaven. They wanted some miraculous token of his divine mission, such as when Moses gave manna from the skies, or when Joshua made the sun and moon stand still, or when Elijah brought down fire upon the sacrifice at Carmel. To this request blended of idle curiosity and unbelief Christ refused compliance, and said that the only sign of this sort that would be given to the evil generation was that of the Prophet Jonah. "For as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation" (Luke). The words recorded by Matthew show how Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, viz., his marvellous experience when swallowed by the fish, "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (*Three days and three nights* are to be computed in the Jewish manner, which applies that formula to one whole day with any part however small of two others.) The sign to be given is that of his own burial and resurrection, which Christ's connects in an enigmatical manner with a well-known incident of Old Testament history. The historical verity of that incident is thus guaranteed by the Saviour's words—words which are not to be explained away by saying as Dr. Hort does (App. p. 282), "It is difficult to believe that all the words as they stand have apostolic authority," or as does Professor Toy ("Quotations," p. 28) that they are due to "the oral tradition;" for the textual authority for them is complete. Our Lord

then says that Jonah's miraculous deliverance from the belly of the fish was a sign to the men of Nineveh, *i.e.*, a mighty deed which confirmed to them the authority of the prophet and influenced their reception of his message, and similar was the intention and in many cases the result of his own deliverance from the tomb. But if the Old Testament story is a myth or an allegory, what are we to think of the New Testament narrative thus put on a par with the former? Surely the same rule must be applied to both. But our Lord went further. He drew a parallel not only between Jonah and Himself, but also between Jonah's hearers and His own, saying, "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold a greater than Jonah is here." The force of this solemn assertion lies in its literal verity. If there was no preaching of Jonah and no repenting of the Ninevites, then it is impossible to see any weight in our Lord's comparison.

It has been said that "the marks of a story are as patent in the Book of Jonah as in any one of the Thousand and One Nights." It is very true that the literary skill shown in the narrative is surprising. Charles Reade, himself certainly no mean judge, has said ("Bible Characters," p. 76), that "It is the most beautiful story ever written in so small a compass. In writing it is condensation that declares the master, verbosity and garrulity have their day, but only hot-pressed narratives live forever. The book is in forty-eight verses or one thousand three hundred and twenty-eight English words. That number does not carry the reader far even in such close models as 'Robinson Crusoe,' the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' 'Candide,' 'Rasselas,' yet in Jonah it gives a wealth of incident, and all the dialogue needed to carry on the grand and varied action. You have also character, not stationary, but growing just as Jonah's grew, and a plot that would bear volumes yet worked out without haste or crudity and with the perfect proportion of dialogue and narrative." If this be so, it can be explained in no other way than that in which we account for the simple and unstudied yet lucid and complete and masterly narrative contained in the synoptical Gospels. The writers told nothing but the truth, but a divine hand directed them what to say and how to say it. And so with Jonah, or whoever made the record that bears his name. The so-called resemblance to an Arabian tale is only on the sur-

face. All those tales are of the earth, and earthy, devoid of any ethical aim and simply intended to amuse. But this narrative has a lofty moral purpose throughout. Even if one accepts the conclusion of Volck in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia (*sub voce*) that the central purport of the book is given in the three positions that the prophet of God must do whatever the Lord commands; that not even death can frustrate his calling; and that he must leave the fulfilment of his message to God, there is still that which widely separates this narrative from every other of those to which it has been compared. The interval is as wide as that between the one living and supreme God and the imaginary *genii* whose aid is secured by magical formulae. But the contrast becomes far greater when one considers the real controlling purpose of the book and what it contains, *viz.*, the rebuke of national bigotry and hard-heartedness, and the vindication of Jehovah's tender compassion toward His creatures even outside the bounds of the Abrahamic covenant.

This fact dispels at once and forever the notion that the book is a poetic myth based upon tradition, or a mere expansion of some ancient incident which may or may not have been historical. There was nothing in the character or the habits or the tastes of the Hebrews at any time during the eight centuries before Christ to suggest or to invite any such composition. Everything pointed the other way. The habitual thought of the people was that they were the favored and accepted people of God, having the true worship and the certain hope of continuance, while all other nations were idolatrous, depraved, and sure in the end to be the victims of the divine wrath. The intensity and inveteracy of this feeling may be gathered from the evidences of its survival to the time of Christ and its passing over for a time at least into the Christian Church. Dr. Wright has brought this forth with his accustomed lucidity: "The efforts made by our Lord in His lifetime to raise the degraded classes of the Jews were not looked upon with favor by the Pharisees and scribes (Luke xv. 1, 2). The very disciples of Jesus, who were directed by the Master to go into all the world and make disciples of all nations, showed a deep-seated and decided reluctance to believe that God was no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him (Acts x. 34). The early Christians were amazed when the Holy Spirit was bestowed upon the Gentiles." Dr. Wright justly remarks



that "There is little reason to be surprised at the picture of Jonah sitting over against Nineveh, angry and sullen because God had granted repentance and life from the dead to that city after it had been doomed to destruction, when the disciples of Jesus, in the full enjoyment of a Pentecostal effusion of grace, found it so hard to believe in the loving-kindness of God." And, in fact, it took a long course of years and many efforts of the great Apostle to emancipate the Jewish believers from their prejudices. Their great desire was to bring Gentile Christians under the yoke of the old law. They insisted that these disciples should become Jews, and like the servants of Abraham should receive on their persons the sign of circumcision. This led to the first great controversy of the new dispensation, and to settle it the council was called which met at Jerusalem, and after a long discussion came to a conclusion in favor of liberty (Acts xv.). But even this did not settle the question in practice as it did in theory, for the struggle was renewed again and again. Once even Peter and Barnabas were constrained by the adverse feeling to dissemble the broad and liberal views they had before held and expressed on this question (Gal. ii. 11-14). Nor indeed was it finally settled and laid to rest until the period when the temple was destroyed, the city overthrown, and the Gentile element in the Church shown to be a decided majority. And it is fairly argued by Dr. Wright that the attitude of the Church on this question under apostolic leading was one great reason why the Jews so largely refused to recognize the claims of Christianity. They could not bear to admit that the Gentiles ought to be admitted to an equal position with themselves. The two stumbling-blocks in their way were the doctrine of Christ crucified and the equality of the Gentiles, and the latter was as great as the former. When Paul at Jerusalem related in Hebrew the story of his conversion and the vision he had seen of the glory of the Lord Jesus, he was listened to patiently, far more so than was the proto-martyr Stephen when he addressed the council, but when the Apostle proceeded to state that Christ had sent him to the Gentiles, the Jews could abide his speech no longer, but lifting up their voices with one accord, they cried out, "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live" (Acts xxii. 22). Thus did the Jews, the prophets of humanity, intended by Divine Providence to be the teachers of religion to the world, act when the very mission they had been se-

lected and appointed to discharge met with its grandest success. Such now being the prevailing habit of mind toward the heathen world, how could there have arisen among them of their own accord any conceptions of a message to the metropolis of the nations, designed to lead this great capital to repentance and thus avert the deserved judgment that impended? What welcome could such a story receive? What inducement was there for any one to devise or circulate it?

This is still further confirmed by a reference to the prevailing tenor of prophecy in regard to Assyria and its capital Nineveh. In this point of view the material miracle in Jonah's preservation in the belly of the fish is far outstripped by the moral miracle shown in the mere fact of the prophet's mission to Nineveh. That stands alone in the whole history of the covenant people. Nothing like it occurred from the days of Samuel to those of Malachi. The great empire whose seat was on the Tigris is often mentioned in Scripture, but always in its relation to the covenant people, either as an oppressing foe which is one day to be destroyed, as in the vivid pictures of Nahum setting forth the assault, the siege, the capture, the overthrow, the final and remediless ruin, or in Zephaniah's mention of the day of Jehovah's anger, the *dies ira*, when He will make Nineveh a barren waste where wild animals roam and the pelican and the porcupine lodge amid the fallen columns, or as an alien who is one day to be converted into a friend, as in Isaiah's memorable utterance (xix. 24, 25), "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth for that the LORD of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance." In marked contrast to these and all similar utterances is the Book of Jonah, which makes no reference whatever to any antagonism between Israel and Assyria, and does not point at all to the distant future, but deals only with the present. The prophet is summoned to bear a divine message to Nineveh, not because of past injuries to Israel or because such are apprehended in the future, but simply because of its wickedness which is such as to attract the attention of the Most High; and Jonah is bidden to announce its overthrow within a limited period. The only reason for such a warning beforehand was that an opportunity of repentance might be afforded. This Jonah understood at once and hence his refusal to act.

It was unprecedented that the heathen should be dealt with in this way, and he was not disposed to be an agent in the work. This has usually been regarded as a personal defect, due to some unusual narrowness of disposition. But this may well be doubted. Probably any other prophet would have done the same. To admit individual Ninevites or even the whole city to the privileges of Judaism upon condition of their adopting circumcision and the ceremonial law would have been nothing strange, but to show mercy to the heathen as heathen, and simply upon the condition of repentance was a new departure. The case of the widow of Zarephath (1 Kings xvii. 10) is not analogous, for Elijah went to her because his life was not safe anywhere in Israel, and since the Sidonian widow received him and sheltered him he gained for her a great blessing. Still less is there any similarity in the case of Naaman. Not only did he apply himself in person for what he needed, but came with money enough for a king's ransom to pay for his cure if pay were wanted. The circumstances at Nineveh are wholly different. No application is made, nothing in the condition of Jonah or the people to whom he belonged invited any such mission as he effected. The whole movement is original, spontaneous, and free from any ulterior thought.

A weighty argument against the allegorical interpretation of the book has been adduced by Dr. O. M. Mead in his recent volume on "Supernatural Revelation," which contains in an Appendix a short essay on the subject. The substance of his forcible reasoning is here reproduced. One point is that if the book be an allegory the author must have intended it to be so understood, but as it was not so regarded by those for whose benefit it was written, he must be considered as having made a bad failure. This point becomes still more serious when it is claimed to be an inspired ideal, for then the failure goes back of the human author to the Divine Spirit under whose influence he wrote.

Another point is that the very considerations which are urged to prove the book to be unhistorical equally bear against the assumption of its didactic character. We are assured that its chief events, the strange conduct of Jonah in his flight from the presence of God, the story of his miraculous preservation through the fish, the improbability of so long and toilsome a journey as he is represented as making, the lack of details in the account of Nineveh and its king, the thorough and universal repent-

ance, are intrinsically improbable, and that therefore the story is not historical and was not intended to be understood as such. Thus Kuenen says, "The whole of this writing—which interpreted historically so justly gives offence—breathes a spirit of benevolence and universal humanity which is very attractive" ("Religion of Israel," II., 244). What else can this mean than that if God had really brought about by His providence such occurrences as are narrated in this book, it would have been justly offensive; but if the occurrences are only *imagined* to have taken place, they convey a most attractive lesson? Can anything be more absurd? The theory of Dr. Wright, the best sustained of all that have been devised to escape the natural and rational interpretation of the narrative, maintains, as we have seen, that it was composed in order to justify God for not having fulfilled the prophecies against the heathen which are so conspicuous in the writings of the Old Testament seers. Now admitting this to be the case, although no evidence can be adduced for it, the question arises how this end was to be gained? The answer is that the narrow conceptions concerning God's dealings with the heathen and His purposes toward them, which were cherished by the writer's contemporaries, would be corrected by the story of the Prophet Jonah's preaching to the Ninevites. This is quite satisfactory, if the narrative was true and related actual occurrences, but not at all if it was fictitious. For in that case the narrow-minded contemporaries might justly reply, How can fiction give evidence in favor of truth? And especially how can a story which contains extravagant and incredible statements furnish a proper basis for rightly conceiving the character of God? If the story is true and what is related did really occur, we do have a most winning and convincing statement of the gracious nature of our covenant God; but since it is merely a work of the imagination, it leaves the case just where it was before. The terrible predictions as to the utter ruin of the great world-powers still stand, and we await their accomplishment with some disappointment that it is so long delayed; and to meet the case you put us off with an allegory, you relate a narrative of inherently improbable, nay impossible events. We decline to accept your ingenious fiction as an offset to certain and acknowledged facts. Thus it is seen that the theory of a didactic purpose in the book and the theory that it is a pure and acknowledged fiction, are mutually destructive. Fiction cannot do the work of

truth. Fictitious narratives may and do often powerfully excite the feelings, but they cannot turn doubt into conviction or unbelief into belief. That is quite beyond their province. The illustrious men whose names have come down to us as models of heroism, self-sacrifice, charity, or devotion make a deep impression so long as the record made of them is deemed trustworthy, but let it be resolved into a myth or an allegory, and the charm is at an end.

It is time to sum up.

1. The book has every appearance of being a record of facts, not a hint to the contrary being anywhere dropped.

2. It was evidently so regarded by the compilers of the Old Testament Canon.

3. The same view prevailed, so far as we have any evidence on the subject, among the Jews in the time of Christ.

4. The modern opponents of this view differ widely as to the date of the book's composition, some putting it in the eighth century B.C., others in the second, the times of the Maccabees, and the rest at various intermediate periods.\*

5. They differ also as to its character. Some make it an allegory, others a legend or tale, others a myth, intermingled with Grecian or with Babylonian elements, others a moral fable or parable, and others a prophetic didactic fiction.

6. The objections they make to its reality, whether founded upon its place in the Minor Prophets, its style and language, its lack of details, the improbability of the events it records, or the failure of the historical books to mention them, are all without foundation.

7. If the book was intended as an allegory, it failed of its purpose, as it was not so regarded by the Jews.

8. If it was a didactic fiction it could not answer the end proposed, because as a fiction it could show only what God might do, not what He would do or was actually doing at the time.

9. If it was not amiss to feign that God acted as the book represents Him, where is the harm in considering that He really did so act?

10. If the narrative viewed as fiction is honoring to God and helpful to man, surely it is immeasurably more so if it be considered strictly historical.

11. The testimony of our Saviour is conclusive. He referred to Jonah and Nineveh just as He did to Tyre and Sidon, to Sodom and Gomorrah, or to Noah and the deluge,

or even more emphatically; and by consequence all are alike historical.

12. If the book is a fiction (whether inspired or uninspired makes no difference), the solemn warning of the Lord Jesus to His contemporaries is utterly pointless.

I conclude with two sentences from Dr. Donald Fraser's "Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Scripture" (I., 340). "The stones of Nineveh have risen already within our own lifetime to cry out against the men of this generation who were incredulous of Bible history. But there is to be a greater resurrection on those famous Eastern plains, The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here."

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

## THE DIFFICULTIES IN SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D., PASTOR OF THE FOURTH AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY.

THE Bible is a composite of apparently sixty-six books (which may be reduced to fifty-seven) written by at least forty different authors during a period of fifteen hundred years. That a work thus constituted should have a substantial unity is a wonder unparalleled in the history of literature. This fact, if carefully considered, would alone prove that a divine influence has marked its production. From the tree of life in the beginning of Genesis to the tree of life in the end of Revelation the view of God and man is the same, and the holy philosophy taught is one. Man is throughout a sinner. God is the holy and righteous Judge and the merciful Saviour. Bloody sacrifice is the medium through which man comes to God, by which He maintains His justice and yet justifies the sinner. The Infinite Judge is thus the pitying Father to every one who will have it so. There is no conflict of doctrine anywhere in the Bible.

1. The oppositions that men have alleged between the Old Testament and the New have been the results of superficial thought. Changes have been rung on the antagonism of Law and Gospel, as if the Old Testament prescribed good works as the efficient means of salvation, while the New Testament prescribed faith, when the truth is that the Old Testament is full of faith and the Gospel, and exhibits God's holy law as a rule of

\* For details on this point and the next, see Lange's "Commentary, Minor Prophets, Jonah," pp. 3, 11.

life for those who accept salvation by faith in the sacrifice appointed of God. From Abel to Noah and from Noah to Abraham the bloody sacrifice is the symbol of a substitute bearing man's sin, and faith, not work, is the efficient factor in the worship. "By faith Abel offered up." "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." It is God's mercy, and not man's obedience to law, that saves man, and this is the doctrine of the Old Testament as much as of the New. The typical ceremonies of the Old Church were no means of salvation, but types of the coming One in whom faith centred. The fact that the Jews perverted these types and made them saving ordinances no more alters the truth of their character than the same perversion of ordinances in the present Church of Christ. The godly soul finds the self-same teaching in Exodus as in Matthew, in the Psalms as in John.

2. Next to this difficulty about the two Testaments we may place the doctrinal difficulties that men find in the teaching concerning the fall of man, the incarnation of the Word, the substituted sacrifice, the salvation by faith, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. These doctrines are said to be contrary to the reasonable propositions that God would not let man sin; that God, who is Spirit, could not be man; that one suffering for another is unjust and does not meet the end of punishment; that works have far more merit than faith, and that to confound the Divine Spirit with man's spirit is absurd. These difficulties regarding the cardinal doctrines of Scripture are to be answered by the truths that man is sinful, however it came about, and that as a sinner it is for him to look not to himself, but to God for salvation and restoration to holiness, and that the Scripture professes to be God's way of saving sinful man. It will be seen that a free will in man implied the power to sin; that, if man was made in the image of God, there is nothing incredible in the Son of God becoming man; that in Him thus becoming man and suffering, man's sin was punished in man, and that the saved are those who, by the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, are made one with the Son of God who became man. The salvation is thus reasonable and in full accordance with the holiness and justice of God. But these difficulties of doctrine, though so readily explained, will never be received by the evil heart of man until he bow humbly before God as speaking in His Holy Word.

3. After these difficulties come those of a lower nature. First, there is the difficulty

about miracles. Old and New Testaments both narrate many miracles, and if these are falsehoods the revelation is a cheat. Those who would eliminate the miracles destroy the whole authority of the Bible, for they are interwoven with the whole texture of Scripture. You cannot take out these threads without ruining the whole cloth. But miracles, instead of being a difficulty, ought to be a witness to the truth of Scripture. A revelation of God without a miracle could have no weight in the human mind, for the mere learning about God from the works of nature is no revelation in the sense we use the word. A revelation demands a miracle. We can conceive of none without. A revelation is extraordinary, something outside of the ordinary course of nature. It must have a specific and direct action on the mind, that it may not be mistaken for anything else. And hence it must have the credentials of extraordinary events impossible to man, and yet wrought by man as evidence that God chooses him as His mouthpiece. So Moses, the prophets, Christ and the apostles, all who furnish us with the Book of God, wrought miracles in confirmation of their divine calling and message. Hence the words of Peter, "Jesus Christ approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs." This is the function of miracles, and we would not be justified in accepting anything as God's Word unless it were proved by miracle. Miracle confirmed the Old Testament dispensation, and only miracle could set it aside and confirm the New in its place. Otherwise we should yet have the old ritual as our form of worship.

That miracles are impossible is the assertion only of the atheistic mind. If God cannot do works impossible to man, then there is no God. The proof of miracles is that of ordinary human testimony.

4. After the difficulty regarding miracles and the supernatural, which we assert to have no basis in reason, we may put the matter of discrepancies in the Scriptures. Of course it would be impossible in a brief paper to catalogue the alleged discrepancies and meet them all. There are useful books in which this has been done more or less completely, as, for example, Haley's "Examination of the Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible," published at Andover in 1881. Many of our best commentaries explain satisfactorily the points at issue. All we can do in this article is to call attention to a few general facts regarding these alleged discrepancies. In the first place, thousands of intelligent and learned Christians have



never found them to be the slightest hindrance to their full faith in the Scriptures as the Word of God. It is certainly a remarkable thing, if these discrepancies imperil the plenary inspiration of the Bible, that men like Sir Isaac Newton, Faraday, and hundreds of as distinguished scientists, accustomed to close and accurate reasoning, rendered the Bible their profoundest homage as God's Holy Word. Contradictions in the teaching or statements of Scripture would not only have been seen by such thorough Bible students as they were, but have been honestly exposed by their upright minds. Instead of that we find them bowing before the sacred record and commending it most earnestly to the acceptance of all. Such a fact would be impossible, if the discrepancies of Scripture were what the infidels would have the world believe. When we take up the discrepancies we find that a very large proportion may most readily and reasonably be referred to clerical error in copying manuscripts. Especially is this the case with numbers, which were denoted in manuscripts by light marks in connection with letters. How often among ourselves do we find a 3 copied as 5, or the letter o confounded with the cipher 0. Many instances of like confusion we certainly find in the Old Testament. No defender of the Bible's inspiration imagines that all copyists were inspired. All such defenders affirm that the *original* writing of prophet or apostle was immaculate, both because it asserts itself so to be, and because *à priori* a revelation from God that was liable to error would be a useless revelation and utterly dissonant from the character of God. Another form of discrepancy, the anachronisms, such as the naming of a place in a writing which was written before the place was so named, or the reference to events not as yet taken place, is also readily and reasonably explained by the supposition of an editor inserting these. We have just been reading an edition of Ammianus Marcellinus, wherein all the places in Gaul and Germany which he mentions have their modern names, which Ammianus never heard. Does that discredit the authenticity of his history? It must be a very weak mind that would object to the authenticity of the Pentateuch as the work of Moses because the death of Moses is recorded at the close. Other discrepancies are imagined by a lack of understanding of God's truth, as, for example, when it is said in 1 Chron. xxi. 1, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel," and in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, "And again the anger of

the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." The supposed discrepancy here between Satan's authorship and God's authorship of the numbering is owing to ignorance regarding the great truth that Satan is allowed by God to work evil in certain directions for the punishment of God's people. God is the author of the event, because He, as governor, permits it for His governmental aid, and yet Satan is the proximate cause. Just so God hardens Pharaoh's heart (Ex. x. 20), and yet Pharaoh hardened his own heart (Ex. viii. 15). Ignorance in objectors accounts for many supposed discrepancies like this. Errors in translation may be added as causing apparent conflicts of thought, as when the devil is spoken of as one, and yet many devils are frequently represented. In this case the plural "devils" should be "demons." So the change in the meaning of a word causes in the unlearned reader a conflict of idea, as when our Lord tells us to "take no thought for the morrow," as contrasted with the injunction we have to walk circumspectly and to imitate the ant that lays up for the future. The Revised Version, by substituting "be not anxious" for "take no thought," relieves the reader's mind.

5. Another class of alleged difficulties is based on the silence of the Word. Because the Scripture has not explained, therefore the objector says the difficulty is inexplicable. This is a favorite field of objection with the modern rationalists. The silence regarding the special sin in David's numbering Israel, regarding the antecedents of Saul's two sons and five grandsons ("his bloody house") who were hanged, and regarding Achan's family is in each case made the ground of the accusation of injustice and cruelty. The silence in the historic record regarding many of the rites prescribed in the Mosaic law is made the ground for counting that law an invention of a late age. This argument from silence is always a rickety one. You make it efficient only when many conditions are supplied. By itself it will bear no weight. We might argue that Israel was never in Egypt, for, if the nation had been there, the record would have mentioned the pyramids. Or we might prove that the British Parliament did not exist in 1776, because the Declaration of Independence mentions only the king as governing Great Britain.

We must bear in mind that the Bible history contains in a few pages the record of thousands of years. Now the greater the

disparity between the number of years and the number of historic pages, the greater is the weakness of the *argumentum a silentio*. The lacunæ in so succinct a narrative must be many and great, and common sense is left to fill them up in any of many ways, but it is the grossest injustice to make them the sources of alleged defects in statement or doctrine. When a rational connection can be formed, it is simply a wicked prejudice against God's Word that will insist on an irrational one, and then make that false inference the basis of an assault upon the Scriptures.

6. Another class of difficulties in the Scriptures belongs to their Oriental character. The Oriental mind is full of analogy and spirit. The former leads the speech to symbolism and the latter to hyperbole and paradox. Hence we have these figures of speech abounding in the Bible. The symbolism runs through the ceremonial law, not only in the services of the tabernacle, but in the ordinances for the daily life. The prohibition of linsey-woolsey garments, of ploughing with ox and ass, of seething a kid in its mother's milk, and other similar commands had all their meaning in their symbolism. So, too, when our Lord tells us that from him that hath not shall be taken away that which he hath; that he who findeth his life shall lose it, and he who loseth his life shall find it, and that we are not to labor for the meat that perisheth, He is using the paradoxical form of expression, which was thoroughly understood by His hearers, and must not be literally taken by us. When the sacred writer states that all Judea was baptized of John in Jordan, his hyperbole could mislead only an idiot. Especially will these figures appear in the prophets and in the Apocalypse. Literal interpretation would be absurd. A translation must be made of each figure before the mind can read the connection, and such a translation should be carefully made and consistently framed. The Bible is not to be held responsible for the false interpretations that crude commentaries have given it. The most contradictory explanations of the prophets have been made, but this is not because the prophets are inconsistent, but because the explainers have been reckless. There are certainly difficulties in these divinely inspired writers, but they are difficulties that should beget persevering study and not unbelief. Modern discovery is helping much to this end, and the more thorough understanding of Oriental thought is clearing away the darkness.

In this hasty glance at the difficulties in

Scripture, we address ourselves to those who seek to have them removed. There is another class, who are ever seeking to increase the difficulties and multiply their number. It is their aim to derogate from the authority of God's Word. That aim is proved in their treatment of the Bible by their uniform acceptance of a contradiction rather than a harmony when both are offered to the reason. A philosophic hatred of inspiration and the supernatural is at the bottom of their partial and ungenerous methods. To such cavillers we do not address ourselves. We address those who stand by the Son of God, and hearing Him say, "Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of Me," "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead," take those Scriptures, that Moses and the prophets, and explore them reverently, heartily, and with a docile spirit as the Word of God.

### THE PSALMS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

From *The Sunday-School Times*, Philadelphia, June 28, 1890.

#### I.—THEIR HISTORIC PLACE IN THE DEVOTION OF ALL AGES.

JOHN BRIGHT has told me that he would be content to stake upon the Book of Psalms, as it stands, the great question whether there is or is not a Divine revelation. It was not to him conceivable how a work so widely severed from all the known productions of antiquity, and standing upon a level so much higher, could be accounted for except by a special and extraordinary aid calculated to produce special and extraordinary results; for it is reasonable—nay, needful—to presume a due correspondence between the cause and the effect. Nor does this opinion appear to be unreasonable. If Bright did not possess the special qualifications of the scholar or the critic, he was, I conceive, a very capable judge of the moral and religious elements in any case that had been brought before him by his personal experience.

Upon the most superficial survey of the Psalms in their general aspect, it seems difficult or impossible to regard them as simply owing their parentage to the Mosaic system. Some, indeed, of their features, may well be referred to it; especially the strong sense of national unity which they display, and

the concentration of that sense upon a single center, the city of Jerusalem and the temple.

It may also be noted that the Mosaic law inculcated in its utmost breadth the principle of love to God. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." \* Yet may it not be said, from the place in which it occurs, that this is rather exhortation than statute? Further, it is not unfolded in the detail of the legislative Torah; and even in the Decalogue service is enjoined without the mention of love. The early books do not exhibit, like the Psalter, the close, inner contact of the individual soul with the deity; and, as water does not rise above the source, it is hard to ascribe to them the wonderful development of that principle which pervades the body of the Psalter. We seem compelled to assume for them some loftier fountain-head of instruction. This, I would submit, is in part supplied, and in part suggested, by the Book of Genesis. I say suggested, inasmuch as the outlines of a primeval religion drawn in that book are not less slight than they are significant. So slight, indeed, that I cannot resist the impression that there were supplementary communications of Divine truth, over and above those contained in Holy Writ, and perhaps traceable in later portions of the Old Testament. And I also say supplied, inasmuch as the story of the Fall involves in full the idea of our restoration in character as well as condition, which is nowhere enunciated in the Law; and further inasmuch as it sets forth, at least down to the time of Abraham, a personal intercourse, habitual and direct, with the Deity, and one pointing onward to the great redemption.

In a preceding paper I have represented that the Mosaic law was not the promulgation of a new and complete religion, but a code of provisions intended for the particular purpose (1) of building up a wall of effectual separation between the Jewish community and the corruption of the nations whose land they were to conquer and to possess, and (2) of preserving in vitality and freshness, within that precinct, the fundamental conceptions of the Divine unity and righteousness, and of the duty and the sinfulness of man. These all-important propositions were the necessary preconditions of any plan for the restoration of peace in a disordered world. But they were in process of extirpation from the gen-

eral and public religion of all those Gentile races, whose history is given us in Scripture, or in the classical books of profane antiquity.

Thus the Mosaic system, while it was defensive against the surrounding iniquity, was also something more, and something higher. That system, both institutional and doctrinal, fenced in, as it were, a clear space, a free and secure domain, for the fuller development of a religion, inward and personal, devotional and spiritual, the materials for which it could hardly have supplied by presenting, as it did, God as ruler and judge, and man as a servant who continually either sinned, or was on the brink of falling into sin.

In the inner sanctuary, thus provided for the most capable human souls, was reared the strong spiritual life which appears to have developed itself pre-eminently in the depth, richness, tenderness, and comprehensiveness of the Psalms. To the work they have here accomplished there is no parallel upon earth. For the present I put aside all details, and am content to stand upon this fact,—that a compilation, which began (at the latest) with a shepherd of Palestine, three thousand years ago, has been the prime and paramount book of devotion from that day to this; first for the Hebrew race, both in its isolation and after it was brought by the translation of its sacred books into relations with the Gentile world; and then for all the Christian races, in all their diversities of character and circumstance. Further, that there is now, if possible, less chance than ever of the displacement of these marvelous compositions from their supremacy in the worship of the Christian Church. And beyond doubt it may be also said that their function has not been one of ritual pomp and outward power alone. They have dwelt in the Christian heart, and at the very center of that heart; and wherever the pursuits of the inner life have been most largely conceived and cultivated, there, and in the same proportion, the Psalms have towered over every other vehicle of general devotion. We have a conspicuous illustration of their office in the fact that of two hundred and forty-three citations from the Old Testament found in the pages of the New, no less than one hundred and sixteen are from the single Book of Psalms, and that a similar proportion holds with most of the early Fathers.\*

\* Canon Cook, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, Vol. IV., p. 146. There is a minor, but still not unmeaning, indication to the same effect, which it would be unseemly to couple with that given in the text, but which I venture to name for its recency and because it is eminently associated with the general course

\* Deuteronomy 6: 4, 5.

Bishop Alexander has published the result of a careful examination made by himself. It is that reference is made to the Psalms, either by quotation or otherwise, in no fewer than two hundred and eighty-six passages of the New Testament.\*

We have thus before us the fact that the Psalms, composed for the devotions of the Hebrews from two to three thousand years ago, constitute down to the present day for Christians the best and highest book of devotion. A noteworthy fact even on the surface of it; more noteworthy still when we go below the surface into the meaning. The Hebrews were Semitic, Christendom is Aryan; the Hebrews were local, Christendom is world-wide; the Hebrews were often tributary, and finally lost their liberties and place; Christianity has risen over every obstacle, and has long been the dominating power of the world. The Hebrews had no literature outside their religion, nor any fine art; Christendom has appropriated, and even rivaled, both the literature and the art of the greatest among the ancients. This strange book of Hebrew devotions had no attractions outside Hebrewism except for Christians; and Christians have found nothing to gather, in the same kind, from any of the other religions in the world. The stamp of continuity and identity has been set upon one, and one only, historic series; one, and one only, thread runs down through the whole succession of the ages; and, among many witnesses to this continuity, the Psalms are probably among the most conspicuous. This stamp purports to be, and to have been all along, divine, and the unparalleled evidence of results all goes to show that it is not a forgery.

The wonderful phenomenon thus presented to us can hardly be said to admit of enhancement; and yet it is, perhaps, enhanced when we bear in mind that the long period of this perpetual youth, exhibited by the Psalms, has been broken by the promulgation of a new religion, together with all the changes of fact and developments of principle which transformed the heathen world.

Moreover, we should remember that the shapings of all language merely human are essentially short-lived, and forms of speech succeed one another as wave follows upon wave. But herein seems probably to lie

one of the ways in which the Divine revelation asserts itself. It seems to have the faculty of giving to things mutable the privilege and the power of the immutable, and to endow fashions of speech, when they belong to the heart's core of human nature, with a charter that is to endure throughout all time.

I submit, then, that the fact of so wonderful a power as was thus exercised by the Psalms, in such diversities of time, race, and circumstances, is not only without parallel, but is removed by such a breadth of space from all other facts of human experience in the same province, as to constitute in itself a strong presumption that the cause also is one lying beyond the range of ordinary human action, and may most reasonably be set down as consisting in that speciality of Divine suggestion and guidance, which we term revelation.

## II.—THEIR ANTIQUITY.

The antiquity of the Book of Psalms, like that of the other books of Scripture, does not directly or universally involve the essence of the case concerning them, which I apprehend is more dependent upon their character and their results. Yet it counts, for importance, in the next order of considerations, since the form and substance are here more intimately allied than in the terms used for the recital of events in an historical book.

It is also to be assumed that the incessant use of the Psalms in the service of the temple, and the comparatively wide knowledge of them thus conveyed to the people, were in the nature of special securities for their faithful and exact transmission.

When we speak of the Psalms of David, we use a popular and general form of expression, which names the whole from the largest or most weighty and most conspicuous of the parts. The phrase is sufficiently shown not to be absolute and precise by the beautiful 137th Psalm, which describes the condition of the Hebrews in Babylon five centuries after the death of the minstrel king. Seventy-three Psalms\* in all are ascribed to him. This is not the assumption or opinion of conservative writers only. Bleek, whose work is revised and sanctioned by Wellhausen, admits it to be a matter of the highest probability that no inconsiderable number of the Psalms are due to his authorship.† He also, with others, largely accepts the inscriptions which are prefixed

of modern life. In a manual, not of hymns, but of devotions prepared for public use in the mixed congregations on board a great line of packet ships to North America, I find that out of 254 pages 137 are occupied by selections from the Psalms; the chief part of the remainder being a collection of hymns.

\* "The Witness of the Psalms," Note A, p. 291.

\* Cook's Introduction, *ibid.*, p. 150.

† "Einleitung in das alte Testament . . . besorgt von J. Wellhausen." Sect. 221. Berlin, 1886.



to them. According to Canon Cook, a judicious and able writer, it was never held that the entire Psalter was the work of the king, and he says that in the time of the Maccabees the completion of the book was ascribed to Nehemiah. He thinks that a large proportion of the two closing books (out of the five books composing the Psalter) belong to the period of or following the Exile.\* But of the three Psalms most pointedly referable to the Messiah, two (Psa. 22, 110) are Davidic. He shows how the conclusive objections to the theory which refers the Psalms to the Maccabean age are sustained by various advanced German writers, and Bleek holds that no Psalm can be shown to be later than Nehemiah. But the master idea of the whole argument is not so much that such and such Psalms were produced at such an era, as that the Book at large is the product of that influence which stamps it, like the other books of Holy Scripture, as embodying a Divine revelation.

On this point of antiquity it is more than enough if a large portion of the Psalms are ascribable to King David. I venture, however, to offer two suggestions. First, the Psalms come to us through a channel supplied by the kingdom of Judah, not the kingdom of Israel. If they had been largely composed after the severance of the ten tribes from the two, would they not have presented some more definite indication of that severance? The name of Israel is the name under which in the Psalms the chosen people are described. We have this name repeated twenty-six times. The name of Judah was likely, it may be supposed, after the schism to become the prevailing and distinctive name, still more so after the captivity and dispersion of the ten tribes, and as long as their remnants continued to maintain any serious and systematic rivalry with the Jews. Yet throughout the Psalter we never find the name of Judah mentioned in this paramount sense. Jerusalem is mentioned seventeen times, and Sion thirty-eight, together fifty-five times. But the name of Judah only occurs ten times, and never with this paramount significance. It is mentioned either together with Israel (Psa. 76 : 1 ; 114 : 2), or in conjunction with other tribes, as with Ephraim and Manasseh in Psalms 60 : 7 and 108 : 8, or with Sion, but always locally or tribally. Could this have been so if the Psalms had mainly been composed when Judah was the

only acknowledged name for the elect people, and Israel was a stranger, often an enemy, always the symbol of a rival and proscribed worship?

Secondly, the one great deliverance commemorated in the Psalms (as also, I understand, in the later Jewish Liturgies) is the deliverance from Egypt (Psa. 68, 72, 80, 81, 105, 106, 114, 135, 136). Could this have been the case if the book was unknown until the time when, between the people and their earlier past, there arose up a frightful specter? I refer to the terrible experience of the Captivity in Babylon. And yet, surely, there were circumstances attendant upon that Captivity which might have carved upon the Jewish mind yet deeper recollections than those of Egypt; where, if their treatment had been cruel and degrading, yet they must upon the whole have flourished, inasmuch as they grew there from a family into a people. But the Babylonish captivity entailed, firstly, the loss of what was not only an ancestral home, but the local seat of the Divine promise to their race; secondly, the loss of the worship divinely ordained, and attached to the temple of Jerusalem; thirdly, the loss of that prized nationality, in and by which they were preferred before all the nations of the earth. Is it then conceivable, if the Psalms in general owed their origin to the time of the Captivity, that the composers of them should, in numerous and conspicuous cases, have dwelt so long and so often on the details of the Egyptian bondage, and should never but once, and briefly, have made a specific reference to the one recent catastrophe, choosing rather to go back to the centuries dimmed, in comparison, by the interval of a thousand years?

The arguments, drawn from general features and from historical probability, respecting the antiquity of the books of the Old Testament, are in some degree common to the Torah, or Books of Moses, and the Psalms. The Psalms have, however, the benefit of the admission by the leader of the negative school in our own day, that a considerable number are probably from the pen of David. And there are also points in which reasoning, available to show the antiquity of the Torah, has an enhanced force for the Psalms.

We see, for example, that the history of the Israelites, from the conquest of Canaan to the Captivity, is upon the whole a history of decaying faith. This is exhibited in the original demand for the change to a monarchy from that earlier form of government by judges, which powerfully suggested

\* Cook's Introduction, p. 136. The books are Psalms 1-41, 42-72, 73-89, 90-106, 107-150.

the presence and providence of the Almighty by leaving unoccupied the place upon earth most symbolical of him. It was shown by the increased wickedness of the kings, and by the enlarged and developed office of the Prophets, an army of reserve in support of the Divine dispensation, which takes its position on the field of battle in the hour of need. It is observed by Sack,\* that in the period succeeding the exile the original creative force of the Hebrew spirit died out, and that, as formalism advanced, the sectarian lines of party were sharpened and deepened. In both these periods the spirit and voice of the Book of Psalms throw us back upon antiquity, and even upon a distant antiquity. They seem to be manifestly the product of an age of living, energetic faith. And they are not less eminently notable for the harmony which pervades the religious community. "Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself." †

### III.—THEIR CONTENTS.

Let us now look for a moment at the contents of this book, which are such as to fasten our wonder upon them, and to leave little room for any surprise that they should have established for themselves, in collective worship and in personal devotion, the place to which no parallel is elsewhere to be found in the experience of the human race. And, on the other hand, I shall not fail to notice in their proper place the objections which some have urged against the Book of Psalms.

The multiplication of divinities under the system which we term polytheism, tended to establish everywhere a system of what are termed national gods. These act within the sphere of a particular race or country: they are open to the competition of other deities when through migration or conquest these spheres happen to overlap. They do not claim the allegiance of other races, or show care, or, so to speak, responsibility, for their welfare.

I do not indeed deny, but should be forward to assert, that while, in the early stages of historic antiquity, this nationalizing process seems to harden more and more with the gradual accretions of legendary tradition, we can trace among the mythologies, in various degrees of faintness or clearness, the older idea of a supreme God; of a belief in one Ruler of the universe, anterior and superior to these multi-

form powers. We find in many cases disguised resemblances of that original belief; but it is with such dislocation of its elements, such exaggerations, such intrusion of ideas foreign to it, as to defy all attempts, at least in the present state of knowledge, to ascend the channel upwards to the source. The schemes become so complex as to defy any rational account of their origin; even when their basis is found to lie in the several powers of external nature, which were not known to be connected by any common tie, but which received the names of gods, and were combined into religious systems. These popular gods became realities in two senses: first, subjectively, because as they were accepted in the minds of men, the associations connected with them became a source and spring of human action; secondly, because the images under which they came to be represented gave them a real existence at least in the material sphere. It is, therefore, natural that the Psalms, in phrases concerning deity, should not be confined to the One God, but should say, for example, that among the gods there is none like him, or should exhort the worshippers to give thanks unto the God of gods.\*

Yet no reader of the Psalms can fail to see that they are strictly, unconditionally, and exclusively monotheistic. God is undoubtedly the God of Israel, and the worshippers properly describe him in the terms which most closely correspond with his relation to themselves. There seems to be a great mixture of the terms "Elohim" and "Jehovah," and in none of the five books is the use of the properly Hebrew name exclusive.† But, without drawing any argument from this intermixture, the Psalms make it plain that the God whom they adore is from everlasting, and is the God, not of Palestine, but of the whole world: "Sing unto God, O ye kingdoms of the earth; O sing praises unto the Lord; who sitteth in the heavens over all from the beginning."‡ And his eye and care are over all men. "O praise the Lord, all ye heathen: praise him, all ye nations. For his merciful kindness is ever more and more towards us; and the truth of the Lord endureth for ever."§

No doubt the "Lord" is represented as having special relations with and special care for Israel. But these are relations of affection, not of exclusion. A Psalm declares indeed:

\* "Die altjüdische Religion im Uebergange vom Bibelthume zum Talmudismus, von Israel Sack." Berlin, 1880. Einleitung, pp. 13, seqq.

† Psalm 122: 3. [Prayer-Book version used throughout.]

\* Psalm 86: 8; 136: 2. See Exodus 15: 11.

† Cook's "Introd.," p. 149.

‡ Psalm 68: 32, 33.

§ Psalm 117.

"He shall choose out an heritage for us, even the worship of Jacob, whom he loved."

But the very same Psalm had already sounded the trumpet note :

"O clap your hands together, all ye people ; O sing unto God with the voice of melody : for the Lord is high, and to be feared ; he is the great king upon all the earth."\*

Among the notes, then, of the supreme position of the Psalms, and of the religion to which they belonged, we find this idea of the one God, who is also the universal God, and the universal Governor of men, and who thereby stands broadly distinguished from what we find to be the character of the polytheistic systems and of their heads ; namely, divinity restrained by limits of the races or countries of antiquity.

But the form of the Almighty, thus divested of the limitations of mere nationality, and exhibited in the majesty of perfect Oneness and Omnipotence, revealed itself through the Psalms in other and more tender aspects. His care for the poor and for the stranger might be learned from the books of the Law, and may be traced in other religions among the remnants of true Theism. Still, that is a function of government only, though of benevolent government, and is compatible with the idea of immeasurable remoteness. But in the Psalms is developed with singular force and beauty the idea of Omnipotence in the attitude of nearness to man. In Heaven, and in the underworld, and at the extremities of earth, "even there also shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."† The presence thus brought near is not, as in Exodus,‡ a consuming, but a soothing and sustaining presence.§ Thus brought near, the Almighty is invested in relation to us with all those capacities of action and of sympathy, which fill in human nature the department of the affections. In the mouth of the objector this is termed anthropomorphism. I do not presume to say that there is not in it some prefiguration of the Messiah, made in all such things like as we are. But that there is no deflection from the loftiness of the monotheistic idea we know from this, that the same people who gave utterance to the Psalms have been the most rigid and lofty in their definitions of the Godhead. As when it is said by Maimonides that with God "there is neither folly nor wisdom, like the wisdom of a wise man ; neither sleep nor waking ; neither anger nor laugh-

ter ; neither joy nor sorrow ; neither silence nor speech, like the speech of the sons of men."\* Yet it is he that is not only the guardian of his people, but, as it were, their sentinel ; and not of his people only, but of every one among them, as truly and as much as of the whole. In truth, the two threads of national and of personal Providence are so intertwined in the Psalms that they scarcely can be severed. "He will not suffer thy foot to be moved, and he that keepeth thee will not sleep ;" and then in the very next verse, by a transition not less gentle than complete, "Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." There is no detail too minute for describing the closeness of this protection : "He is thy defence upon thy right hand ;" "The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in : from this time forth for evermore."† But no mere selection can rightly convey a picture of the close and intimate care which this and so many others of the Psalms describe in setting forth the attitude of the Almighty toward his worshiper.

I must not quit this portion of the subject without quoting a remarkable testimony to the elevation of the Psalter from a critic generally negative, but one who makes his affirmative declarations with an exemplary sincerity and fervor. He says of the Psalter : "It is as a whole the expression and fruit of the principles of the Jewish religion, as they existed in the minds of pious Israelites. Its one great theme is the clinging of the human spirit to God. In joy and sorrow, in victory and defeat, in moods of saintliness or sin, the spirit of the poor earthly wayfarer here pours out its plaint and prayer to the God of its life. . . . What exultation is here, for high days of victory and joy ! What touching moans of penitence ! What child-like cries for help ! What entreaties from the soul that can only say, 'Out of the depths I have cried unto thee !' What delightful confidences between the trustful spirit and the Shepherd who leadeth by the green pastures and the still waters !"‡

I must not altogether pass by the Messianic Psalms. These are the songs which show, by the adaptation of their language to him and to his office, either that their composers had a prevision of his coming, or that such prevision was conveyed into their

\* Maimonides, "Yad Hachazakah." Transl. Bernard, Cambridge, 1893, p. 39. Declarations not less remarkable are to be found in the *More Nebuchim*, or "Guide of the Perplexed."

† Psalm 121 : 3, 4, 5, 8.

‡ Seven Lectures by the Rev. J. P. Hopps, vii, pp. 33.

\* Psalm 47 : 4, 1, 2.

† Chapter 19 : 12, 13, 21.

† Psalm 130 : 6-10

§ Psalm 23.

strain by the higher influence which prompted it. It is not necessary here to debate their number. Suffice it to specify Psalms 2, 21, 22, 45, 72, 110. And it is sufficiently plain that the principle of prophecy which is involved in them, whether conscious or unconscious to the composer, is the same which belongs to the other predictions and prefigurations in the books of the Old Testament. But they differ from and go beyond the rest in this important particular. The great and cardinal facts of the lapse of man from righteousness, and of the need and promise of a Redeemer, were thus embodied in the perpetual public worship of the temple, and were systematically forced, so to speak, upon the attention of the people, that they might come into personal and conscious possession of this most precious and absolutely central part of their inheritance.

When the foot of the Greek first, and afterwards of the Roman, trod the streets of Jerusalem, when the treasures of the Hebrew books were unlocked to the Gentile world through the Septuagint, then there happened, we may justly assume, one of two things. There was, as we know upon strong heathen testimony, before the advent of our Lord, an universal and traditional expectation in the East that a great power was to arise in Judæa and to subdue the world. How came it that so remarkable a conception, foreign to the cultivated communities of the Greek and the Italian peninsulas, and apparently menacing the continuance of the Roman dominion, should have been prevalent in the East? The East had, indeed, at certain epochs supposed itself entitled to the mastery of the world: hence the wild expedition of Darius into Scythia, and the repeated conflicts of Persia with the Greeks. It is not strange that this heritage should be reclaimed; for ideas of this kind are tenacious of life, and easy of revival. But what is at first sight most strange is the choice of the spot from which deliverance was to proceed. It was not from any of the seats of ancient power, the fame of which was still on record, but from among the small, isolated, and undistinguished people who inhabited Palestine, and whose brief appearance on the stage of human affairs, as conquerors in the time of King David, was so slight in limit and in duration as to have inscribed no mark upon the page of general history. It had passed away, like the old empire of the Hittites; they were also a people, whose manners and institutions repelled rather than attracted the sympathy of the world. One supposi-

tion explanatory of this remarkable expectation might be that it had lived on from prehistoric times in feebleness and obscurity, but had come to the front when the East felt pressing on it from Rome the hard hand of power, welding it for the first time by a permanent system into uniformity of servitude or inferiority, from which it panted for deliverance. But it seems more probable that the Jewish Scriptures, which had for two centuries become known by translation into Greek, were themselves the fountain-head of this most remarkable anticipation; and in that case it probably proceeded in an eminent degree from the Messianic Psalms, which were of all the available evidence the part most in the eye and mind of the people.

Such being, in outline, the presentation of God to man in the Book of Psalms, let us consider in its turn the manner in which they present man to God. Now this may be set forth in a multitude of particulars, but they are all capable of being summed into one. The Psalms are a book of spiritual communion, not only between God and man, not only between God and his Church, or especially chosen people, but between God and the individual man.

Not that this is the case with every Psalm. Take the noble first Psalm, which opens the book. It sets forth in one part (vs. 3, 4) with a tender beauty, in another with strong and stern denunciation, the positions of the righteous and of the wicked before God. But it sets them forth as it were from the outside. So, again, many of the Psalms, dealing with the Israelites as a whole, have for their theme national deliverance and glory. But let us turn to the penitential Psalms, and most of all to the fifty-first, in which King David \* sounds the lowest depths of sorrow and shame for sin, and has provided for the penitent of every age and every character the medicine that his case required. On these Psalms as a whole, on this Psalm in particular, and again on the thirty-eighth Psalm, most of all in its first moiety, let us fasten our attention for a moment. Have modern learning and research succeeded in extracting from all the sacred books of all the ancient religions of the world anything like, I do not say a parallel, but an ever so remote approach to them? The great discourse of our Lord to Nicodemus, in the third chapter of St. John, finds in these compositions a basis broad enough to sustain the whole of his startling doctrine, "Except a man

\* Some critics argue that the two last verses are an exilic addition.



be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." \*

Penitence thus lying at the door of the process by which man is appointed to ascend to holiness, this golden book supplies, beyond all others, the types and aids for attaining it in all its stages. All that special class of virtues, which were unknown to the civilized world at the time when the Apostles preached them, had been here set forth in act a thousand years before, and stored up for use, first within the narrow circle of the Jewish worship, and then in the Church, which claims, and may yet possess, the wide world for its inheritance. Another standard of virtue, indeed, and in itself a glorious one, the Greek and the Roman world possessed. They had their code of Justice, Fortitude, Temperance, and Wisdom. But this list of virtues contained no recognition of the terrible and world-wide fact of sin, and opened no road to the acquisition of powers capable of contending against it, and of casting down its strongholds to the ground. That road was to be opened by the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, and by the Faith, Hope, and Charity of St. Paul. Is there one of those Beatitudes which has not been, in its blossom or its germ, anticipated by the Psalms? Take the sanctification of sorrow in verse 4: so the Psalm instructs us, "Thy loving correction shall make me great" (Psa. 18: 35). Take the blessing of the meek (v. 5). So says the Psalmist: "Lord, I am not high-minded. I have no proud looks. I refrain my soul and keep it low. My soul is even as a weaned child" (Psa. 131: 1, 3, 4). Principles these not only which the ancient philosophies did not contain, but which they would have repudiated and contemned. Take, again, that blessing of satiety which is promised to "hunger and thirst" after righteousness; words which indicate such an adult age, such a fulness of growth and stature in the new man of the Christian system, that what was at first lesson from without has come to be appetite from within, and part of the untaught spontaneous working of renewed human nature. But this idea is fully developed in the Psalms (Psa. 42: 1, 2): "Like as the hart desireth the waterbrooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God. My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God: oh, when shall I come to appear before the presence of God." Even the doctrine of forgiveness, of doing good to enemies, to the growth of which the conditions of Hebrew life were less favorable, finds expression in the Psalms.

\* John 3: 3.

Take Psalm 35: 12, 13,—“They rewarded me evil for good. Nevertheless, when they were sick I put on sackcloth, and humbled my soul with fasting.” And, again, “If I have rewarded evil unto him that dealt friendly with me: yea, I have delivered him that without any cause is mine enemy” (Psa. 7: 4). It is, I submit, the general strain of the Psalms to which we should look. And who will deny that they habitually abound in humility, in penitential abasement, in the strong faith which is the evidence of things not seen, in fervor, self-mistrust, filial confidence towards God? These and all kindred qualities they develop in what for want of a better word I will term their innerness. Their tones come from the inmost heart, and, not with familiarity, yet with a wonderful nearness, they seem to seek the response, if the phrase may be used without irreverence, from the inner heart of God himself.

All this is severed by an immeasurable distance from the language, ideas, and mental habits of pagan antiquity. What we find there of religion associated with intellectual culture turns upon the external relations between God and man, as between sovereign and subject, or master and dependant. The prehistoric verse of Homer abounds in prayers. They are not such commonly as we should use, yet they indicate fully these external relations. But in the life of later, of classical, Greece, prayer seems wholly to have lost its force and place as a factor in human life.

Again, in the “Odyssey” of Homer we have remaining traces of the personal relation between man and God. In the intercourse of Athene with Odysseus, and reversely in her action on the minds of the guilty suitors, there are distinct traces of the working of a Divine force in the soul of man. I do not remember to have found it in the later classical literature. But the development of the principle and idea of a communion with God, operative on human feeling, thought, and action, is the standing and central thought of the Psalms.

I will only note, in passing, before quitting this subject, two remaining characteristics: the sacredness which the Psalms attach to the claims of the poor, and their sense of the utter worthlessness of all ceremonial observances, though commanded, except in connection with the service of the will, and purification of the heart.

#### IV.—THE OBJECTIONS TAKEN TO THEM.

Referring to what has been said elsewhere on the presence of a human element in Holy

Scripture, I will now say a few words on the special objection which is lodged against the Psalms.

Let me first endeavor to reduce the question to its true dimensions. The criticism is not here, as it might be in some cases of books claiming to be sacred, that they are feeble, or fanciful, or remote from human interests, or that large veins of clay run through such true metal as they contain. The Psalms, in their sublimity and in their sympathy, so immeasurably divine and so intensely human, are proof against all such criticism, which would be only cavil. The only dart which really rings upon their coat of mail, is the dart which carries the reproach of their severe and unmeasured denunciation of enemies.

And first, in order to disembarass the question of matter which appears to be extreme and exceptional, I will refer to the verse which represents the *ne plus ultra* of the difficulty, as it stands in the Prayer-Book Version of the Psalms; in respect to which, we pay a certain price for its incomparable majesty and beauty, in the shape of occasional, though rare, shortcomings as to accuracy. The Prayer-Book gives verses 21 and 22 of Psalm 139 as follows:

"Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee, and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee?"

"Yea, I hate them right sore, even as though they were mine enemies."

Which seems to say, "I have a reserved stock of special and superlative hatred for those who have not only sinned in general, but have sinned against me in particular." But this notion is completely put aside in the translation direct from the Hebrew as it stands in the Authorized, and also in the Revised Version, where the second of the two verses runs:

"I hate them with a perfect hatred; I count them mine enemies."

This does not set up the selfish feeling, about offense personally received, above the sentiment of indignation and resentment against wickedness, but says only, "All that I might feel against a personal enemy, all that natural exasperation would suggest, I discharge upon the enemies of God." But the sentiment concerning them has already been expressed in terms not admitting of enlargement: "I hate them with a perfect hatred." And this brings the objection to a point. It is that this unmeasured detestation and invocation of wrath even upon God's enemies cannot be justified, and is not to be referred to Divine inspiration.

Now let us notice, in the first place, that the general tone of the Psalms concerning enemies is not aggressive, but defensive. A sense of trouble and danger from the might of experienced or impending assault, and an appeal to God for protection, form the staple sentiment of the book. I quote a single instance, which is a fair sample of the whole of this class of passages, from Psalm 56: 1, 2:

"Be merciful unto me, O God, for man goeth about to devour me: he is daily fighting and troubling me.

"Mine enemies are daily in hand to swallow me up: for they be many that fight against me, O thou Most Highest."

Let those who question the assertion I have made, that this passage has a character typical of the whole, refer (among other places) to Psalms 5: 8; 6: 7; 7: 5; 6: 27, *passim*; 56: 9; 59: 1; 69: 4; 18: 71, 12; 138: 7; 143: 9.

But undoubtedly a certain number of passages are not defensive, they are denunciatory; such as 54: 5, 7; 59: 10; 92: 11; 143: 12. I will recite this last verse in full, for it brings into view the sentiment which forms the base of all these passages: "And of thy goodness slay mine enemies, and destroy all them that vex my soul, for I am thy servant." If we put these words into paraphrase, the Psalmist pleads that he is engaged in the service of God; that in this service he is assailed and hindered; that, powerless in himself, he appeals to the source of power; and that he invokes upon the assailants and hinderers of the Divine work the Divine vengeance, even to their extinction.

We have, then, to consider these denunciatory passages, first, as they were employed by their authors; secondly, as they are now presented to us for our own use in the services of the Church or in private devotion.

Under the first head, let me observe as follows. There is not one of these passages which tampers with truth or justice; they are aimed at sin, to blast and wither it. "Lead me, O Lord, in thy righteousness, because of mine enemies" (Psa. 5: 8). This is the universal strain. All these passages are strokes delivered with the sword of righteousness, in its unending warfare with iniquity. Nor is there one among them of which it can be shown that they refer to personal feuds, passions, or desires. Everywhere the Psalmist speaks in the name of God, on behalf of his word and will.

But it may be said that such denunciations are excessive in degree, that they are

too severe and savage, and that they are not suitable for the mouth of man.

With respect to their severity, I suggest, and, if need be, contend, that we, in our ignorance and weakness, are no fit judges of the extent to which the wisdom of the Almighty may justly carry the denunciation and the punishment of guilt.

Man, and even civilized man, contemplates with much equanimity the taking of human life for the occasions which he deems sufficient. He knows that in all wars one party must be guilty, and that in most or many wars neither have had a justification for the wholesale bloodshed, which floods the path of destruction that they necessarily follow. Life, which he did not give, and cannot restore, he takes away, for the repression of crime, with general, though not unanimous, approval. It is also taken, even now, in most Christian countries, through duels for private injury or insult; and it is but recently among ourselves that public opinion has become repugnant to the practice. But the scruples, which for ourselves we so easily thrust aside, become active, feverish, and even violent, when, in a world to the abundant wickedness of which our own practice witnesses, the Ruler of that world, who gave life for use, and who sees and judges its abuse, is to be arraigned before our mock tribunal; and we, who cannot and do not rightly guide each our own action, are to undertake to determine his. And this when we have not fully learned and cannot measure either the deep and frightful depravity of the Canaanitish nations, or the purposes with which Penalty descends. We know not whether it comes in mercy to correct the growth of evil before it shall become incurable, and whether, or how far, when opportunity had been exhausted here, resources may still have been held in reserve to be expended for good in the great elsewhere. To pronounce verdicts upon these terrible denunciations may be impious, and is surely at the least unreasonable.

"And who art thou, that on the bench would sit  
To judge what is a thousand miles removed,  
With the brief vision of a single span?" \*

There is certainly more claim to substance in the objection which urges that these denunciations are unsuitable for man. But here I should interpose the question, To what man? The wonderful nature, in which we have been created, is in nothing more wonderful than in the diversity of the conditions under which it can subsist and

work, on its road from embryo to perfection. As those stages accumulate, the moral code becomes multiform and involved. In simple forms of life, and in early stages of society, the roads between right and wrong were short, broad, and clear, like as were the spaces of the battle-field, whereas contending hosts are now divided by miles and leagues from one another.

But, further, the Psalmists, and the nation to which they belonged, lived under a different dispensation from ours. If we accept the Scriptures, that nation held a divine commission to establish the right and to put down the wrong, in a sense in which no such commission is now given. For us it is enough to hope that at any given juncture we may be doing the will of God; but what we hope, they knew; and sight for them was mixed with faith, in a degree and mode remote from the spirit of our later, and in this respect, perhaps, higher, training. They were accustomed to short accounts with the Divine Justice, and to reward or suffering as the immediate consequences, and, therefore, as the direct attestations of the judgment of God upon the moral conduct of man. The responsibility, which is for us diffused and indefinite, was for them concentrated and palpable. But, besides this, they had the great standing institution of prophecy; and the king in whose ears Nathan's words had thundered, "Thou art the man," might well feel that his contract was a close one with the mind of the Almighty, and that he might, upon occasion, speak his strongest words under guidance from on high.

I do not pursue farther these remarks, which are no more than tentative and approximate. But I do not find myself justified in the assumption that we are in all cases to have a complete cognizance of the conditions under which the Psalms give judgment upon the unrighteous, or are intended to arrive at final judgments on the question what the Jews might, and what they might not, suitably be commissioned by the Almighty to denounce.

More immediately are we concerned in the question as to the place held in Christian devotion, and especially in public ritual, by the denunciatory passages of the Psalms. But the answer to this objection, I apprehend, lies near at hand. All scruple, at least all tolerable scruple in this matter, seems to rest upon the supposition that the passages are aimed at creatures who have characters mixed with good and evil, and who, therefore, are not presumptively fit subjects for our unmixed, indiscriminating

\* Dante, *Parad.*, XIX., 81. Pollock's translation.

denunciation. But can any one reasonably suppose that these declarations are in the mind and sense of the Church directed against any human enemy? Our human enemies, if we are so unhappy as to have any, are not the most watchful, the most subtle, the most destructive of our foes. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against . . . the rulers of the darkness of this world."\* But the Holy Scripture and the Christian religion teach, and our human experience largely testifies, that there are spirits whose meat and drink, so to speak, it is to extend the domain of evil, to deepen corruption, to destroy happiness by destroying innocence, which is its base, to add both in range and in intensity to the misery and the sin which have made the world so sad. If this be so, then I contend that to pray for the abolition or paralysis of their work and of its agents, and this especially when we meet as Christians to set forth solemnly the collective needs and aspirations of mankind, is a practice which requires neither justification nor apology.

Apart altogether from the question, what may be the value or completeness of the foregoing defensive suggestions, I would remind my readers that they relate not to the main body of the question respecting the Psalms, but to a portion of it, which is limited and exceptional. Nor do I perceive how, if we approach this question on the grounds and in the spirit of reason, it is possible for a person so approaching it to set aside the mass of evidence which establishes the unparalleled and unapproached position of the Psalter in its antiquity and use, in its pure and noble theology, and in a moral and spiritual character witnessed afresh in the judgment and practice of each succeeding age. And, if the several parts of this evidence link themselves into a compact and harmonious whole, it is not reason, but unreason in the mask of reason, which declines or omits to acknowledge the presumption thence arising, that the Book is at a level indefinitely higher than has been reached by the unassisted faculties of man, and that the power which raised it to that level can only be Divine. Such a conclusion will survive even the approving reference in Psalm 137 : 9 to a practice of savage warfare. Were it true that the image of gold had feet of clay, we might indeed be perplexed by the combination ; but would not this be just, as we often are perplexed by other combinations presented to us in the

providential government of the world? And not only in the providential government of the world, but in the fulfilment of our personal relations with other men. Yet we do not put an end on that account to such relations ; nor do we cease to believe in God because we, such as we are—God save the mark—cannot comprehend the reason, or even discern the rightfulness of all he does. In like manner, so neither can we refuse to admit sufficient evidence of an origin more than human for the Psalms, on the ground that we see only through a glass darkly, and that they present incidental features analogous in principle to those which in other departments our experience brings before us.

London, England

### THE PASSION PLAY AT OBER-AMMERGAU.

From *The Guardian* (Church of England), London, June 4, 1890.

EVERY traveller has experienced the impossibility of conveying his impressions of places he has visited to those who have never been there. And yet some description of Ober-Ammergau is necessary if you have never seen the distant range of the snow-covered Bavarian Alps over the Starnberger See, and watched their peaks grow higher as you approached them, and their glorious valleys grow broad around you as the train sweeps through their forest of dark pines, or over the fertile plains beneath them flourishing with long patches of rye, or glorious with a wonderful wealth of many-colored flowers, among which are thousands of wild pansies and golden immortelles, while on the mountain-side, sprinkled with blue gentians, grow great bunches of the double crimson peony and the white hydrangea, brought down to the stations where the train stops, by merry groups of Tyrolean peasants in their gay costume, with feathers of the *Spielhahn* in their hats, and their alpenstocks in their hands. For this is the framing of the Passion Play picture, the ground carpeted and colored with flowers, the bright green of the young spring leaves of the forest trees against the rising background of dark pines that ends in craggy peaks of gray rock ribbed with snow, and their hollows fluted with glaciers. The line from Munich ends at Oberau, and from here a splendid zig-zag road winds up a beautiful mountain-side, with glimpses of forest-clad valleys and mountain peaks at every turn, to a mountain pass from which the

\* Ephesians 6 : 12.



road runs level to the monastery of Ettal, whose monks have long departed, leaving, among other things, a memory of their famous brew, whose successor cheers, but not inebriates, in the inscription still remaining, "God bless the Ettal beer." Soon rises on the left the peak of the Kofel, sweeping upward from a broad, fertile valley, through forest pines, to a rocky peak like the giant fang of some huge lion, crowned with the great cross, now gilded by the setting sun, and standing like a sentinel above the picturesque village of Ammergau immediately below. The first view of the village is very picturesque. A long double row of Swiss chalets, their walls newly colored, and their broad over-hanging eaves fresh painted, leads up to the church, with its curious pagoda-like tower, round which radiate streets in various lines, giving many a picturesque corner of frescoed walls, and drooping eaves, and more pretentious houses, colored outside with huge frescoes representing Scriptural and allegorical scenes, painted with much taste and skill by the "Judas" of the Passion Play and his brother artists. The crystal Ammer winds through this picturesque jumble and the spurs of the Kofel form a rampart beyond, while the broad valley sweeps onward past Unter-Ammergau to the fertile plain.

But if I find it difficult to describe the scenery that surrounds the picturesque town how shall I convey any impression of the character of these refined peasants, whose dignity never suffers from their self-effacing good-nature, their courteous kindness, and their inextinguishable good-humor? We were received on Saturday, the 24th, by Sebastian Zwick, the first violin of the orchestra, who, in spite of the never-ending stream of carriages and omnibuses tourist-laden, stood list in hand, and with the most pleasant good-humor assigned to us, one after another, our respective houses in the village, with a charming welcome and a pleasant word or two about our lodgings.

On Whitsunday the bells of the church rang out at three o'clock on a fresh bright morning, and Mass after Mass was said by priests waiting their turn, until at nine High Mass was most beautifully sung by the chorus of the Passion Play, accompanied by its orchestra and the organ. The church was filled with a congregation whose simple devotion was as remarkable as is sometimes its absence in Italy. The first English celebration provided by the S. P. G. began at eight o'clock in a room of the Art Exhibition, and a second celebration of Holy Communion followed the morning service at ten.

The day was bright and beautiful, and the streets were all day thronged with people. English and American visitors mingled with groups of Bavarian peasants and German tourists, eating and drinking at tables in the street under the blossoming chestnuts or under leafy trellised arbors, with good-humor and happiness supreme. In the evening a procession of all imaginable vehicles followed each other along the road bringing the thousands of spectators who were to witness the play on the morrow; and yet in all this crowd there was no confusion, no hurry, no word or gesture to offend: all were kind, courteous, and happy. On Monday morning the gun was fired at three o'clock, echoing round all the hills like rolling thunder, and the deep bells rang for service after service, until at six o'clock a rattle of drums preceded a burst of music, and the orchestra marched down the street to the church, crowded from end to end, and High Mass was sung with the greatest reverence, all the performers of the play being present. There is nothing to distinguish them from others of their class but their long flowing hair and their peculiar absorbed look. It was curious to hear the remarks in the street as they mingled with the crowd: "There is Petrus;" "That man plays Pilate;" "There is Caiaphas, the Burgomaster Lang, and his daughter, with that sweet, pathetic face, is the Gottesmutter Maria;" "The Christus is a wood-carver, Judas a fresco-painter, St. John waits at our table," and so on.

When Mass was finished the performers and congregation left the church for the theatre, which at eight o'clock was filled to its utmost capacity by a crowd of 4600 people. It was a wonderful sight. From the orchestra swept upward in a gradual rise a dense mass of human heads in the open air, shut in by the high boarding, over which one saw the Alps in the background bright with morning sunshine. The plane of human heads swept backward under the covered places, which, although double the price of the uncovered area, were the worst both for seeing and for hearing. I had a place only three rows from the stage where I could see every expression and hear every word, and the intense fascination that grew upon the audience throughout the play was heightened by the fact that there was not one word, motion, or expression that was not graceful and dignified, and inspired by the highest reverence and the deepest feeling. The beauty of the dresses, nearly all made in the village, the perfect representation of the different *tableaux*, the dignity and grace of bearing, and the deep reverence with

which every word was uttered, were alike remarkable. There was no self-consciousness, no made-up faces, no tinsel ornamentation, and when the stage was crowded by hundreds of people there was no confusion whatever. How these simple peasants can produce such a performance is most wonderful. Their hands are hard with toil, their faces tanned with exposure, and yet they have a beauty of expression and a dignified, unconscious grace in every gesture and motion which could only come from true courtesy of soul. Exactly at eight o'clock a gun was fired, and the orchestra began its solemn introduction. The front part of the stage is a broad platform open to the air; behind this is a square covered building, to the right and left of which are broad passages leading back, and on one side is the house of Pilate, and the other the house of Annas, both approached by a broad flight of steps. The curtain is down. It has in the centre a picture of the Moses of Michael Angelo, and of Isaiah and Jeremiah from the roof of the Sistine Chapel. While the orchestra is playing the members of the chorus slowly emerge from each side and meet in the midst of the broad platform in a long line, the sopranos on the left, the contraltos on the right, and the tenors and basses on each side of the choragus. They are dressed all alike in a cream-colored loose tunic, edged with gold from shoulders to feet, over which is flung a beautiful robe of one rich color (a different color for each), edged with the old Greek pattern in gold. The colors were as follows from the outside to the centre in the same order: Pink, brown, purple, light blue, red, dark blue, crimson, purple, green, dark blue, very dark red, green, and the choragus in the centre in scarlet; each one had gold fillets with a cross over the forehead, and the girls' hair was loose; all were shod with sandals.

The impression is profound as the chorus slowly enters to the solemn music, and the members stand in a row when the choragus, in a noble voice of great power, delivers his greeting in "recitative," and exhorts us to holy contemplation of the sacred drama that represents the purpose of God, Whose wrath is just, but "I will not, so saith the Lord, the sinner's death; he shall live; My Son's own blood shall reconcile him." The theme is taken up by the full chorus in a grand strain of exalted harmony that is a most deeply moving preparation to the whole play. Still singing, the chorus divide in the centre, and gradually sweep backward into a double curve, forming two wings, from the platform to the outside of the central cur-

tain, where they remain. The curtain rises, and discloses the *tableau* of Adam and Eve expelled from Paradise by the angel. The chorus begins, "Mankind is driven from Eden's groves. Flames in the cherub's hand the sword," and continues the theme after the curtain has fallen, and while the next *tableau* is preparing, showing how "The way is barred to the tree of life." Soon the second *tableau* follows, "The adoration of the Cross," wherein the way to the tree of life is restored. The chorus then retire as they came, behind the scenes, and the first scene begins of Christ's entry into Jerusalem. This method is repeated throughout the play. Each act is preceded by the entrance of the chorus in a line, the introduction, and their formation into two wings on each side of the *tableau*. This constant change of theme and sentiment coming between the acts forms the most beautiful feature of the play. It is an ever-varying change of scene and color. The music is so good, the movement so graceful, and the combination of color so beautiful, that one is carried on insensibly from hour to hour during the ten hours that the play lasts without the least sense of weariness or fatigue. It would take so long to explain the *tableaux* in detail that I am unable here to do justice to their beauty and impressiveness. Suffice it to say that it was universally admitted by every one of the hundreds of visitors that I heard discuss the play that the *tableaux* were most wonderful. Indeed, for the most part, in speaking of them, people gave way to expressions of astonishment. The same cannot be said of all the acting. One would willingly refrain from adverse criticism of any part where all was so reverent and devotional, but indiscriminating praise is undesirable if a criticism is to be a statement of true impressions. Let me say, then, that to me in the early scenes the Christus was a disappointment. In the closing scenes the intense weariness that Mayr constantly wears fitted the character completely. But he has only one facial expression the whole time, and that is always the same weary, troubled sorrow, without any emotion whatever. Of all scenes, the Agony in the Garden was the most wanting in this display of variety or depth of feeling. It seemed stilted and unreal. But one gradually forgets his face in the intense pathos of his voice. I think this was most remarkable in the yearning love which spoke in the warning to St. Peter—"Mein Petrus," said he, in a tone of loving anxiety, and then paused—and also in the warning to Judas, spoken with such earnest pity. In conversation Mayr was al-

most perfect. Who shall blame him that his humanity was unequal to the tremendous call upon it, or be other than grateful that his faults were merely those of omission, and that there was not one word or excessive action that could pain or jar the most devout?

The entry of the Christus into Jerusalem was the first scene, and the suggestion of a great multitude was well sustained, while all, even the smallest children, performed their part well as they sang "Heil Dir! Heil Dir! O David's Sohn," waving their hands and branches of palm as the Christus rode through them dressed in a fawn-colored tunic and a pink robe. It was here that the intense weariness of Mayr's face struck me so forcibly. There was an apparent insensibility about it, and the face was so evidently far too old, for Mayr is now forty-seven. The twelve Apostles are a very striking group indeed, bare-headed, with flowing hair and long staves in their hands.

In the second scene, where the Christus drives the merchants from the Temple, the surprise of the people and the anger of the traders are well represented. The scattering of the money, the breaking of the pitchers as the tables fall, and the pigeons flying away, are all sufficiently striking to explain the anger of the traders, while the difference in the simple dress of the Christus and his disciples and the pomp of the priests brings out the reason for their indignation at being flouted and condemned. While in the fourth scene the change in the multitude "who cried Hosanna to-day and crucify to-morrow" is shown to be due to the people's fear of the priests, one of whom "Nathaniel," is a really fine actor, who denounces the curse of Moses on every one who does not hold with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and so terrifies the people by fear of the Law that they turn round and denounce the Christus, and determine to follow the "holy Sanhedrim." So we see the meshes of the net woven round the Christus, and with loud shouts, again and again repeated, of "Moses is our prophet; praised be our Fathers," the first act closes. The chorus enter and describe the "wicked wretches" meditating vengeance, "Auf, lasset uns auf Rache sinnen," and the first *tableau* of the second act is Joseph cast into the pit by his brethren. The suggestion that Joseph's dress is a mark of special dignity gives the motive for the action. The first scene of Act. II. introduces us to the Sanhedrim and the commanding figure of Caiaphas the High Priest, who is represented by Burgomaster Lang. His presence is

noble, his manner imposing, his loud, rich voice is deliberate and commanding, and with his magnificent dress he is altogether a most striking figure. One gets perhaps a little weary of the Sanhedrim, but the plot is like a well-woven net, the malice of the traders supplying an opportunity for the Christus for his audacity in condemning them, and they are employed to tempt Judas by a bribe to betray the place where the Christus might be taken, and by suggesting that the informer would "deserve the gratitude" of the holy Sanhedrim in addition; as the intention being evidently to show Judas as in reality unnecessary to consummate their designs, but merely as the readiest tool in their hands. And now comes, preceded by a beautiful *tableau* of the departure of Tobias from his home—perhaps the most touching piece of the whole play, judged at least by the results upon the audience. It is called the parting at Bethany. The first scene is the Christus with his disciples, to whom he foretells his approaching passion and death. This scene is very good, their sorrow and perplexity so well represented by their earnest eagerness to know all, restrained by that reverent courtesy that fears to do more than suggest their caution. The second scene gives the meeting with Simon, Martha, and Lazarus, and Simon's invitation to the guest-chamber, where we see them all in the next scene. Peter's anxiety that the Christus should remain in safety among those loving friends is answered by Mayr with the words, spoken most impressively, "Shall the reaper tarry in the shade when the fields are ripe for harvest?" Then follows the anointing by the Magdalene, which was poor in conception, and the carping of Judas followed by the warning entreaty, "Friend Judas, hand on heart, is it only sympathy with the poor that moves you?" As the scene goes on the shadow of a sorrow settles upon them, and as they leave the Christus comforts Magdalene with the words, "The night cometh and the winter storm, yet in the spring garden thou shalt see me again." Then comes the most affecting parting between the Christus and his mother. The Blessed Virgin's part is taken by Rosa Lang, a girl with a beautiful, strongly marked face, and a voice capable of expressing deep emotion. I was so near that I saw every expression, and the flush of real emotion on Mary's face was no mere acting, as she sobbed, "Mein Sohn, mein Sohn!" The strong peasants and foresters round me wept like children at this affecting scene.

Of course, one might criticise the difference of age of these two, Mayr being forty-seven, and Rosa Lang twenty-two, but the actors are chosen for their private characters, as well as their personal fitness; and the Christus must be, so one of the players told me, the most "christlich" man, and the Maria the most holy woman in the village. They must live their parts for ten years before they may act them in the play.

Act IV. is introduced by the Vashti rejected by Ahasuerus, "figuring God's purpose for the synagogue," and Esther chosen queen, preceded by a wonderful chorus, "Jerusalem, awake! awake!" These various *tableaux* form a never-ending series of shifting color and expression. Christus and the disciples approach Jerusalem, and converse as they go upon the events that are to come, and then after warning Judas is left alone. Judas is taken by Johann Zwink, and he is made a very prominent feature. His acting is the only "stagey" part of the whole play. It is said, however, by the villagers to be better than that of Lechner, who took the part previously. His face and manner are quite traditional, and Zwink's idea is that of a shallow, impulsive man, whose good desires are not strong enough to resist the avarice and anxiety about the morrow, which lead him to put gain before principle. After Judas retires in every scene the people laugh among themselves. Why, it is hard to say. It certainly is not at his acting. He is found meditating by "Dathan" and the traders, of whom he is at first suspicious, but when they promise him a large reward and future advancement he consents to betray the place where his Master will be with the disciples that night, and yields. His soliloquy with himself is good. If the Sanhedrim succeeds, he will confess his part. But how now to meet his Master's gaze? "He will see that I am a—; no, I am no traitor. I only show them where he is to be found."

Act V.—"The Last Supper"—is introduced by the entrance of the chorus, who announce the "new feast," which is preceded by the *tableaux* of the "Manna in the Wilderness," represented by falling flakes of paper, and then "The Return of the Spies," bringing a huge bunch of dark grapes, each as large as a cricket-ball. The grouping of the multitude was most impressive, and these types of the new feast most suggestive in their poetic fitness. The grouping of the "Last Supper" is from Leonardo da Vinci's famous picture, but the appointments of the table were peculiar. A

very thick, flat, round "loaf" was in the centre of the table, and this, when the Christus raised it, I saw to be a cake studded with raisins. There were large desert dishes full of apples, pears, and grapes. There was no suggestion of the Jewish Passover. The Christus walked round from one to another, and placed a morsel in every disciple's mouth. The distribution of the cup followed in the same way. The scene was historically incorrect, but the action and the words had a deep pathos, especially the washing of the disciples' feet. The discovery of the traitor was dramatic, and the words "Thou hast said," though spoken loudly, were unnoticed because others were also talking at the time. The "sop" was another morsel of the same bread given to Judas into his mouth as before. The act of the betrayal is preceded by the *tableau* of Joseph sold by his brethren. The guilt of Christ's death is shown to lie entirely with the Sanhedrim, who treat Judas contemptuously as their despicable tool. Act VII., preceded by the *tableaux* of Adam and Eve laboring, and the murder of Amasa by Joab, to signify the labors of the Saviour, and the falseness of His friend, contains the agony and the arrest. The scene of the agony was most disappointing. It was conventional and lifeless; but the scene of the arrest was highly successful. The sudden appearance of the band of armed soldiers and the clank of weapons in the peaceful scene was most startling, and here the quiet dignity of Mayr was most consistent and appropriate.

With the arrest the first part ends, and an interval of an hour and a half followed, during which I took the opportunity of asking all I met their impressions. They all expressed their wonder at the marvellous beauty of the performance. Criticism was, of course, natural, but there was no expression of disappointment at the general result, which in all cases exceeded expectation. The second part opens with a grand chorus of beautiful and affecting music, and the remaining hours of the sacred drama passed like minutes, in the ever-varying interest of the *tableaux* and scenes, which are too long to follow in detail. The despair of Judas was somewhat forced, but his character most distinctly stands out as the realization of a good conception, and his final action, where he tears off his girdle under the gnarled tree, is dramatic and appropriate to this idea, as was his querulous denunciation of the "bloodhounds" who betrayed him. From this time Mayr's expression of the Christus is more and more appropriate to the scenes. The contrast of this weary, dig-



nified, silent sufferer with the proud bombast of Caiaphas, the weak wrangling of Pilate, the contemptuous insult of Herod, and the mocking, laughing, jeering band of cruel soldiers was most impressive. Pilate's action was not haughty, while there was too little pride in Herod; but the haste and eager fanaticism of the Jews were well sustained. "Petrus" and "Johanna" were two most typical figures, and the denial of Petrus, surrounded by a band of soldiers "hail fellow well met," yet cruel and vindictive, who discuss what should be done to the disciple who cut off the ear of Malchus, together give a reasonable conception of the denial scene, and when the Christus comes in and looks on Peter he buries his face in his robe and walks mournfully away. The music of this part is surprisingly good, when we remember that it was written by a resident in the village in the seventeenth century. It is most powerful in appropriate conception, though at times it was not well sung. Part 3, the *Via Crucis*, begins with two *tableaux*, "Isaac bearing the wood up Mount Moriah," and "Moses pointing to the brazen serpent." The procession to Golgotha was very impressive. Mayr carries a very heavy cross on his shoulder, and as he stumbles with it an unconscious sigh of pity passes like a wave through the crowded audience. The Christus is driven on with jeers and blows, shrunk together with pain and weariness, with a rope round his waist, dumb and suffering mutely. A curious mingling of history and legend occurs in the incident of Veronica, which takes place when the Christus says, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me," and after the procession has passed the scene closes and the chorus reappear, clothed in black, to sing a long piece of music set to beautiful words, "O who can this high love conceive, which loveth unto death?" The curtain rises, and the two thieves are seen already upon the crosses, their arms over and tied under the transverse beams, and the Christus is seen extended upon the cross, which lies upon the ground. The cross is slowly raised, and there is the marvellous picture before your eyes. I was as near as any one in the theatre, and yet it was quite impossible to detect how Mayr was fastened to the cross. The iron rest under the feet was seen after the bodies were taken down, but the thieves had certainly no other support, and their tied hands became perfectly livid. Mayr was on the cross for twenty minutes, and I heard an English doctor say he could scarcely forbear from shouting "Take him down." It is a feat of great endurance, under which

Mayr has sometimes fainted, while in the summer he says the gnats annoy him fearfully. It is a painful sight, almost too painful, intensified by the dead silence of the vast audience. All the familiar details were gone through. The parting of the garments, the derision of priests, soldiers, people, and the words from the cross, were all carried on in sustained dialogue, during which time it is only possible for Mayr to move his head. And then when the Christus bows his head, thunder is heard, and dark clouds descend, while a messenger rushes up in a fright to say that the veil of the Temple has rent. It was strange to see the mist upon the spurs of Kofel descending upon the mountains about this time, and veiling the whole scene in a gray gloom, during which the bodies of the thieves were first taken from the crosses after their "legs were broken," and, as I saw behind the scene, they staggered away. Then the body of Christus was reverently and carefully taken down, after the piercing of his side with the spear. The details were taken from the picture by Rubens, and the body was laid at the feet of Maria, in a scene quite painful in its intensity. The wound of the spear was on the left side, contrary to every picture I have seen, and was cleverly managed by a thin plate, which when pressed released a dark red fluid that stained the jersey Mayr had on with a large spot of crimson.

Act XVII. is "The Resurrection." The chorus enter again with their beautiful robes, and announce "All is now accomplished. Peace and joy! His strife has brought us freedom, His death has brought us life." The scene is a rocky wall with a huge door that bursts open, and the body of the Christus, clothed in white, floats forth, and disappears. The last scene is hurried on with the appearance to the holy women at the grave. The final *tableau* of "The Ascension" was the most beautiful of the whole play. The Christus slowly ascends, surrounded by a halo of angels, and as the disciples stand with their arms extended the chorus sings a burst of music, "Praises sing all heavenly hosts, To the Lord praise and glory, worship, might, and power be His for evermore."

It is no doubt possible to criticise such a performance adversely if one goes there to do so. But I would ask, what greater proof of power and success can there be than the fact that nearly 5000 people sat spell bound for nearly ten hours in almost perfect silence, through rain and hot sunshine, without one sign of weariness or exhaustion? I

cannot criticise the performance adversely, for it seemed to me to be a wholly reverent and pious act of devotion, performed by these peasants (who, whatever the caviller may say, are still simple and unaffected and sincere) to the very best of their power. To say that the performance is "getting theatrical" is to say what I cannot understand. The dresses and scenery have been redesigned by Lautenschläger, the first theatrical artist in the world, but the peasants are peasants still. Their manners are the same; their play is their own. Their quiet life of ten years between the performances is too uneventful for them to be spoiled. I saw the Christus two hours after the performance in the street, dressed in a poor peasant's clothes, standing, hat in hand, talking to some visitors whom he had recognized, with that courtesy of demeanor which is these people's peculiar charm. They are accused of many things, for rumor is spiteful, and critics are, as I know, not always capable of judging such a performance at all. But they are not extortionate, as my bill will show. 3s. a day for my room and attendance, 1s. 6d. for a well-cooked meal, and this in one of the best houses of the town. I bought some mementoes of wood-carving, and they cost less than half what I should pay in London for them. I met with nothing but cheerful good-humor, kindness and attention. Their only feeling seemed to be that we were doing them honor by coming to see the play, and regret that we were leaving, a regret that we certainly shared. In the evening we strolled about the town. The cows and goats came home to the music of the bells, and as evening settled down the music of a piccolo echoed from the side of the Kofel, which we had climbed the day before. We left the happy valley next morning with regret, but delighted to have witnessed this wonderful representation, and certainly sharing the satisfaction and surprise expressed by all the travellers whom we accompanied on the way, some of whom had seen two previous representations (in 1860 and 1871), and found nothing to suggest degeneration from that high ideal which is the result of the holy vow of 1630.

#### MEN IN CHURCH.

From *The Church Times*, London, June 6, 1890.

WE never read a discussion of the question "Why do not men go to church?" without being reminded of the well-known story of the mayor of a provincial town who,

when asked why he had not received a Royal visitor with a proper salute of guns, replied that he had, with the utmost respect, exactly forty reasons to offer. "In the first place, your Highness, we have no guns." "We will not trouble you for the rest," was the gracious reply. So for non-attendance of men there may be forty or four hundred reasons adducible, but, unless experience has forsaken her seat, there must be one or two, at the most three, causes lying at the foundation of the neglect, causes which, once understood, will explain the whole position, and materially aid the discovery of remedies.

The numerous letters sent in by our correspondents on this subject easily group themselves into two classes, of which the first, the faddist, is rather the larger. We regret the preponderance, but we are not without gratitude to the writers, who are at least in earnest, and have our respect for their manifestation of determination and courage, seeing that they help us to gauge the probable ratio of Churchmen who are led astray by side issues and hammer away on cross-roads and by-paths, entirely disregarding the sign-posts which would set them right if only they could stop to read them. It would be amusing, were it not provoking, to notice how estimable persons can bring themselves seriously to propound solutions which bear their error on the surface, as, *e.g.*, when one writer gravely suggests that the particular pitch of a reciting note for a tiny part of the Church service has an immediate connection with the crowds of men (and women) who regularly make their Sunday exodus to Henley, or some other delightful resort, for aquatic dissipation, forced there by the agony induced by curates endowed with high tenor voices. Another would have us go to Germany and learn how to draw men to church by a system of popular choral music, but he forgot to tell us whether the Germans have commonly adopted the system, and, if so, why Berlin is worse than London in the matter of church attendance.

Two correspondents, "R. H. A. B.," and "J. S. C.," have avoided fads, and struck at roots, the latter especially, by attributing decay of Church attendance to ignorance and infidelity, and his letter, by the way, has many points which the clergy would do well to consider attentively.

Looking at the question broadly, our answer to it is, "Men don't want to go to church," but if any are not satisfied with this we must adopt the Socratic method and ask "Why should they go?" Why, indeed? Have they not been taught that sermon

hearing is the *Alpha* and *Omega* of church attendance, and can they not read as good, or even better, sermons in books and newspapers at home? And why must they be bound to listen Sunday after Sunday to one who perhaps knows no more than his people of Christian truth? Can they not read their Bibles at home, and get as much good in that way? There it is, the secret lies in that fatal word "get." Church-going must be all getting, otherwise men will not trouble to go. They despise the unfortunate beggar who attends every Sunday in the sure hope of a loaf, or the parson's old coat, and yet unless they too can receive some *quid pro quo*, never a step will they take to the House of God. They must have bright and attractive services, plenty of life and movement, everything must be free and of the best description, nothing must interfere with the comfort of these self-regarding attendants, or else they will stay away and worship their God at home, or in the leafy shades of the peripatetics.

The primal duty, therefore, of all who desire to see the courts of the Lord's House well trodden is to teach true principles of worship, to set before men that for six days' blessings their Father asks at least a part of one day's public acknowledgment; that an all-receiving, never-yielding life is but another term for decay and death: and that a religion without sacrifice is worth exactly, or rather less than, nothing. In the Church of England we have wrought more harm than good by our system of spiritual pauperization, doing too much for the many at the cost of a few, by pandering to selfish instincts, and by allowing present generations to enjoy spiritual blessings at the cost of their forefathers; and the decay we are lamenting we have taken the surest means of producing.

Before reform can eventuate, Churchmen must face that question, Why should they go? and offer a better answer than many of us have hitherto given. Suppose, instead of tempting, bribing, cajolling, huckstering, and what not, we try the other course, and offer room for the expansion of man's highest powers. Then "Why should they go?" will be answered thus: To exercise the prerogative of their royal priesthood, first in that glorious consummation of priestly effort, the Mass, and then in whatever branch of worship may be specially theirs.

With this first principle well in view, it is legitimate to proceed to other important, but still subsidiary, matters; to show, *e.g.*, that on the chief priest of each congregation there lies the weighty responsibility of per-

forming the several details of his office with edification and encouragement to his brethren, that the order, frequency, and character of services should be settled with due regard to the powers and capacities of individuals, as well as of the general body of the faithful, that no let or hindrance be put in the way of each member rendering according to his ability and will whatever may contribute to the general welfare. We repeat, however, that these are subsidiary matters, and can only be determined healthily when the main principle is thoroughly conceded and understood.

But turning to the first answer we offered, viz., that "men do not want to go to church," other considerations of a practical nature come into operation. The very term "want" affords a glimpse of the truth, and indicates, what so many who discuss this question are inclined to forget, that some process is needed by which men are to be brought to a sense of their need and duty as worshippers of God. That worship, *scilicet* Church-going, is not a natural want of man is evident to all who know anything of human nature. Men can and do live very comfortable lives without it, as anyone may see who will stroll around the parks on a Sunday morning, or make himself acquainted with the lives of some thousands of people in and out of London: they can live without worship as easily as the blind fish in Kentucky caves live without sight or light, and are equally ignorant of their loss. If the sense of the want is to be active, we will not say acute, a man must have conviction and habit, or habit and conviction, the order is immaterial, although both are necessary, and it matters but little practically which comes first in realization. The habit is entirely under human control, conviction is only in part dependent upon human effort, yet that part is a necessary correlative of the secret and higher Agency. In the rule of the English Church it is assumed and intended that conviction is to be brought about by instruction and grace while the habit is being formed. Children, being baptized, are to be treated as integral parts of the divinely human body, and as the consciousness of divine relationship is being developed, so we must endeavor that the habit is in process of settlement.

All this, we grant, is mere commonplace teaching, and yet as we read of and observe the actions of many professing Churchmen nothing is more clear than that the commonplace is ignored and sometimes denied. Otherwise how are we to explain the coldness and indifference with which numbers of

Churchgoers regard the development of spirituality in their children? Thousands of parents never trouble themselves as to what sort of Christian teaching their children get, or whether they get any at all or not. Children are left to choose church or chapel, the streets or the school, on Sundays, just as they please; and then people wonder how it is that with our enormous apparatus for inculcating the Christian Faith, so many persons grow up and live in total disregard of one of the plainest duties of Christians. We shall cheerfully risk the danger of being called faddists by some of our friends, and assert that the initial and chief cause of neglect of Church attendance lies with the parents. The home is the God-appointed training place for young Christians, and if parents were to see to their duty, and pray and labor for the conviction of their children, while they at the same time take them to church, and so train them in the habit of regular worship, we should have far less complaint about the non-attendance of men at church. Until parental duty is performed, all other efforts can only meet with comparative failure, but when the father and mother do their share, secondary methods will act with real force. The little feet that have learned the way to church by the side of father or mother will and do continue in the same path when they are no longer little, and father and mother are lying at rest in God's acre. Home influences never die, they may be strained to breaking point, may be reduced almost to the last thread, but break altogether never. We know and recognize this in every other department of child life, why then are men so blind as to ignore the fact in that side which is above all and beyond all important to the future well-being of child and Church? Let us bring a little common sense into our religious affairs.

Habit and conviction create want, and without them men "don't want to go to church," and for our part we don't see why they should, certainly least of all for the base reason of getting what they can as cheaply as touting religionists choose to provide it for them.

We have not yet dealt with the special question of the attendance of men, as compared with women, at church, nor was it possible to do so without settling preliminaries. Many of our correspondents have given true and sensible reasons for the disparity, but the list is not exhausted. There are more women than men, to begin with; the army and navy, foreign travel, and commerce help to decrease the available supply

of men; men more easily than women can take their Sunday exercise on tricycles, and they are doing so increasingly; and men have their clubs and lecture halls open on Sundays: these are causes which must be taken into the reckoning. But there is a darker side. Men, as a whole, are more prone to certain forms of anti-social sins, and, say what we will, are honest enough not to attend church and pretend godliness while they are following impure, drunken, or gambling courses. The vices of women are generally less socially dangerous and open, and many a woman whose evil temper, pride, vanity, self-love, or lying is as sinful in the sight of God as the more gross sin of her brother or father, feels the social disablement less and attends church with open if not self-regarding composure. Men have a natural hatred of mere appearances, and although, as a whole, more charitable in judgment of others than women are, are more candid in self-acknowledgment of sin.

Let any guide of souls probe the first half-a-dozen non-attending men whom he meets, and we venture to predict that, next to parental neglect, sin rather than unbelief, or positive dislike, is at the bottom of the most of the neglect. The helping hand is wanted, with the re-assuring voice that in worship the Father of all will welcome the weakest and pitifullest of His children, and the encouragement which only men who have fought the enemy themselves can give to their fellows. Let spiritual men, priests or laymen, see to this, and we shall be surprised if many a vacant place be not speedily filled. To the clergy generally we say, without reserve or hesitation, that it is their duty not to rest until they have made the personal acquaintance of all the men in their parishes, and obtained from them the reasons why they do or do not take their place in public worship. For clerical groaners and ecclesiastical fad-mongers we have scant respect. They are neither useful nor ornamental; their wails and lamentations are distressful to true workers, and the sooner they cease their idle tasks and take to honest labor the better for the Church and their own souls. They will never fill their churches by groaning over the empty benches or devising paper toys for the children of God.

#### DON'TS FOR MINISTERS.

From *The United Presbyterian*, Pittsburgh, June 19, 1890.

A "CHARGE," thrown into the form of don'ts.



Don't study without prayer.  
 Don't pray without study.  
 Don't feed people with unbaked dough.  
 Don't tell all you know in one sermon.  
 Don't put the hay too high in the ricks.  
 Don't offer them sentimental confections  
 or intellectual shavings.

Don't mistake philosophy for Christianity, cant for piety, noise for zeal, or crowds for success.

Don't be so broad that you can float nothing but intellectual chips on your shallow stream.

Don't scold.

Don't wear the cap and bells.

Don't mistake length for profundity nor brevity for wit.

Don't lash the back of the sinner instead of the back of his sin.

Don't offer to other people manna which you have not tasted yourself.

Don't imagine your sermon to be a revelation, or anything but the text to have "Thus saith the Lord" written across it.

Don't let your harp have only one string.

Don't be a vender of nostrums.

Don't try to make bricks without straw.

Don't be anybody but yourself.

Don't let any religious hobby ride you, but don't be afraid to ride any religious hobby, if you have one.

Don't live in the third century.

Don't live in the twentieth century.

Don't live in the clouds.

Don't follow everybody's advice.

Don't try to do anybody's duty but your own.

Don't spare the people's pockets, for therein lie their hearts.

Don't expect the sun to shine through all the twenty-four hours of the day.

Don't expect that all your geese will be swans, or all your believers saints.

Don't restrain too much; it is well, often, that steam escapes.

Don't drive, but lead.

Don't ask anyone to work harder than you do yourself.

Don't see everything that is wrong in the congregation.

Don't carry all your ecclesiastical eggs in one basket.

Don't despise the rich and dishonor the poor, nor esteem yourself wiser than your brethren.

Don't feel yourself responsible for the universe, nor try to spread yourself over creation.

Don't be an evangelist without a message, a preacher without a doctrine, a pastor without devotion, a presbyter without responsi-

bility, or a bishop without watchfulness, and you will not be a servant without reward.

Don't despair.

## A DAY WITH THE CHURCH ARMY.

From *The Nonconformist and Independent*, London, June 5, 1890.

"STEADY, lad! God loves you, and wants to make a gentleman of you!" It was a clergyman who spoke. The man whom he addressed was standing outside a public-house, swearing dreadfully. And the clergyman put his arm round the man's neck and checked him thus. The man was touched. There was something good in him beneath his bad language, after all, and he dragged the clergyman into the house, and—strange gift to such a one!—offered him the remainder of his beer. It was all he had to give!" These extracts are quoted from an article in the *Quiver* for June, by Mr. F. M. Holmes. The incident is good to illustrate "in a striking manner, the chief object and aim of the work of the Church Army," which is further spoken of as "a working people's mission to working people." "Its agents engage in house-to-house visitation, but work in the streets is the greater point. In fact, 'chumming up'—as Mr. Carlile calls it—in the streets is intended to be the principal feature of the work. But its methods are very elastic. It never enters a parish without the invitation of the vicar, and the officer who is sent in response is under the vicar. Should the latter desire the big drum to be beaten, it is thumped vigorously; should quieter measures be desired, they are adopted. In short, the Church Army is in each parish what the vicar desires it to be."

The Church Army "was founded in 1882 by the Rev. W. Carlile, who has since remained with it, and is, we suspect, its real superintendent, with a committee. He was a curate at St. Mary Abbot's, Kensington, and was wont to go out to the High-Street, opposite the railway station, and endeavored to develop the power of some grooms and butlers to speak instead of himself. He found the audience listened even more attentively to their own fellows than to him. That set him thinking, and the Church Army grew out of it. He left the parish where he had been curate, and set to work at Westminster to train workmen evangelists. At first the organization, if such it could then be called, had no home. There was a good deal of failure; but some success

rewarded its founder, who toiled on with perseverance. The principal helper at the commencement was Mr. Edward Clifford, who visited Father Damien at the leper island of Molokai, and he has been treasurer right through. The movement was not much opposed, however, until a real change was wrought in several members of a gang of thieves. Then opposition began. One of the leaders of the gang endeavored once, in the open air, to win back an old companion. Mr. Carlile stepped in between them, and the thief struck him on the head and body, and when he fell to the ground, kicked him on the head. The clergyman was raised and taken into a house, while his assailant was marched off to prison. He was sentenced to six months in jail. Yet in this case again, beneath the sad surface of the man's character and life, there must have been something good, for one of his chums was heard by Mr. Edward Clifford to say—'If he gets three stretchers' (years) 'I shall get a brick and break some head, and work alongside.' There must have been something good, we say, in the man to have inspired such affection, and in his companion also that such feeling should be aroused. In jail the prisoner wrote to Mr. Carlile, apologizing for his assault, and signing himself 'Your loving friend.' When he was released he entered the Army, and the last Mr. Carlile heard of him was that he was engaged in mission work in Chicago. Mr. Carlile cannot say that any change in the man was due to the efforts of the Church Army. It is quite likely, he thinks, that the man became disgusted with and ashamed of himself."

Its efforts appear to have been crowned with success. It has over 12,000 members or soldiers, the majority of whom are rescued drunkards, thieves, gamblers, and others of bad character, who have been reached in the streets. About 170 officers or evangelists and 35 mission nurses, are engaged besides the staff, and it is calculated that about 40,000 outdoor, and 50,000 indoor, meetings are held yearly, while 400,000 visits are paid annually, with Bible-reading or prayer. The Bishop of Liverpool has said of the Army that it "has succeeded in reaching the lowest stratum." The income received at headquarters is something over £4500, and the amount received locally, mostly in the pence of working people, is over £13,000. It is also estimated that the honorary work in connection with headquarters amounts to £1000 yearly.

The method of training these workingmen and workingwomen evangelists is described,

and the remarkable testimony of the Bishop of Bedford is quoted—"that he regards it as having 'settled forever' the question, 'How the masses are to be reached';" and the article concludes: "Much of the progress the movement has made during the seven years is no doubt largely due to the comparative sobriety and elasticity of its methods—sobriety and elasticity, however, which apparently are never permitted to interfere with the central principle that it is a working-people's mission to working-people."

It is perhaps worth the while of Nonconformists to notice that such an organization has grown up within the borders of the tied and bound State Church, which, in this movement at least, seems to recognize the value of elasticity of methods and the utilization of the cornet and the big drum.

### THE PREACHER'S ROOM.

From *The Christian Evangelist* (Disciple), St. Louis, July 3, 1890.

THE following from one of our exchanges brings vividly to mind some sad recollections in the experience of the Associate of the *Christian Evangelist*. We shall always remember that cold, sleety night in December, when we rode three miles on horseback through rain and sleet without umbrella, with a warm friend. We finally reached the house. My clothing on the outside were icy, the inner garments damp, my feet and head were cold and my body chilly. We entered the house, the fires were almost out and all had retired. But there was a nice preacher's room. Although there had been no fire that winter in the room everything was nice for the coming of the preacher. It was now ten o'clock, too late to make a fire and so my good friend turned down the bed at once; everything was perfectly neat and clean. Even the sheets were starched. Yes; and they were soon like two sheets of ice. A poor preacher suffered that night. He was on the sick list for two weeks. He had slept in the preacher's room. Beware of preacher's rooms. Loving hearts prepare them, but they have death in them sometimes. But read the following clipping:

"It ain't ev'rybody I'd put to sleep in this room," said old Mrs. Jinks to the fastidious and extremely nervous young minister who was spending the night at B—, at her house. "This room is full of sacred associations to me," she went on; "my first husband died in that bed, with his head on

Bishop  
regards it  
question,  
' ' ' ' and  
ne prog-  
ing the  
to the  
y of its  
however,  
ed to in-  
that it is  
ing-peo-

Noncon-  
nization  
the tied  
in this  
nize the  
the utili-  
m.

f.

is, July 3,

changes  
lections  
of the  
ways re-  
Decem-  
rseback  
mbrella,  
hed the  
vere icy,  
nd head  
entered  
and all  
preach-  
no fire  
was nice  
was now  
e and so  
bed at  
eat and  
arched.  
heets of  
t night.  
ks. He  
Beware  
prepare  
n some-  
ing :  
sleep in  
the fas-  
y minis-  
B—,  
f sacred  
my first  
head on

these very pillars, and poor Mr. Jinks died settin' right in that corner. Sometimes when I come into the room in the dark, I think I see him settin' there still. My own father died laying right on that lounge under the winder. Poor pa! He was a Speeritualist, and he allus said he'd appear in this room after he died, and sometimes I am foolish enough to look for him. If you should see anything of him to-night, you'd better not tell me; for it'd be a sign to me that there was something in Speeritualism, and I'd hate to think that. My son by my first man fell dead of heart disease right where you stand. He was a doctor, and there's two whole skeletons in that closet that belonged to him; and half a dozen skulls in that lower drawer. Well, good-night, and pleasant dreams."

## A SKETCH OF MY LIFE.

BY FRANZ DELITZSCH.

From *The British Weekly*, London, July 4, 1890.

Published in 1883, in the "*Norwegian Missionary Journal*."

I WAS born in Leipzig on February 23d, 1813, and on March 7th I was baptized there in the Church of St. Nicholas. My father, who belonged to Leipzig, kept at that time, and during my boyhood, a sort of old curiosity shop. He had a very small income, and my childhood was passed in narrow circumstances. My father died on April 9th, 1836, at the age of fifty-four.

My benefactor from my early days was a Jew named Hirsch Levy; he lived near us, and was a bookseller. But for him I could never have made progress with my studies. I went first to a boys' school, and afterward to the free public school of the town, where at that time Plato was director, and Dolz sub-director: there I became a thoroughgoing rationalist. I felt a drawing toward God, but the person of Jesus was veiled for me in deepest gloom. I went to the University to study philosophy and philology, and in my search after truth, I buried myself in the writings of the great German philosophers, and was specially attracted by Fichte.

But one of my fellow-students, named Schütz, who had found and loved the Saviour, labored unceasingly for my conversion. I resisted long, but at this very day I could show the place (in one of the streets of Leipzig) where a ray from heaven brought me

into the same position in which Thomas was when he cried, "My Lord and my God!" From that time I became a theologian. I associated with students who had been awakened by the grace of God, and there were Christian circles in Leipzig in which I moved as a friend. The years 1832—1834, my last three years at the University, were the most beautiful of my life; they were the springtime of my spiritual life, the days of my first love.

I also had intercourse with the Jewish missionaries Goldberg and Becker, who visited the fairs in Leipzig and labored there. These two men taught me to love the nation to which the Saviour belonged, and to pray that it might be converted by the Christ whom it betrayed. Now that I am called "the celebrated Hebraist," it sounds almost comical for me to say that the missionary Becker gave me my first instruction in the Rabbinical writings, and yet it was so. I had learned some Hebrew at the Gymnasium, and this language became my favorite study, but my acquaintance with the Rabbinical writings began when the missionary Becker read with me the tract "Or leëthereb" (Light at Evening-time).

I tried to have some influence on my benefactor Hirsch. My confession to him bore late, but mature fruit; on May 10th, 1848, my beloved benefactor was baptized, and two years later he passed away in peace.

For seven years I gave public instruction to a meeting gathered at the house of a believing friend: some of the members are still alive. Thank God, they are still firm in the faith, and when we meet we confess that our anchor still rests on the old foundation. While on the one hand I was occupied with these practical duties, on the other I was devoted to Hebraic and Old Testament studies. These led me to the school of Rosenmüller, and brought me the acquaintance of Fleischer and of my dear friend Paul Caspari. His object and mine were the same; and, although we differed very widely, still we loved each other; we were intimate friends, and now that I see my friend among the representatives of the Norwegian Church and the Norwegian mission, I praise the gracious leadings of God.

So far I have said nothing about my mother; she was the daughter of the town musician in a little place between Leipzig and Halle. When she became a widow, and was left alone in the world, she started a little shop for the sale of antiquities, and after I had become a professor my mother was still carrying on her trade in old books. The contrast grieved me very much, but she

wished to be independent, and one could not blame her. She was a noble woman. By those who knew her she was loved and honored. She had had little joy in this world, and when, on December 7th, 1857, she breathed her last in my arms, she was glad to be able to die. I am not the only one that from time to time visits her grave. She was a steadfast bearer of the cross, and to her the words in Luke vii. 47 may be applied.

I have often been asked to give some account of my life, but I have never been so communicative on the subject as I am now to my Norwegian brethren. My later life and work may be described in a few words. In the year 1842 I published in Leipzig my work on the Prophet Habakkuk. My book on the Communion arose from the public instruction which I gave; and in my youthful enthusiasm for Jewish literature I wrote my book on "The History of the Post-Biblical Poetry of the Jews." In the year 1846 I became a professor at Rostock, in 1850 at Erlangen, and in 1867 at Leipzig, where I hope to remain for the rest of my life. In Erlangen, at the request of the Jewish Missionary Society of Bavaria, I started in 1863 the Jewish Missionary paper, *Saat auf Hoffnung*. My Hebrew New Testament, which appeared in 1877, is now in its fifth edition. It was pre-eminently the self-sacrificing spirit of my Norwegian brethren which made the publication of this work possible.

I became acquainted with my wife through my religious instructions. Her mother and her brother accepted Christ. On April 27th, 1845, we were betrothed. Four children were the offspring of our union. Johann, the eldest, died on February 3d, 1876, as a licensed professor of theology, just as he had completed a treatise on the symbolism of Oehler. He is buried in the Protestant cemetery at Genoa. On January 17th, 1872, his brother Ernst had passed away: he had taken part as an army surgeon in the Franco-German War from its opening to its close. Not till long after peace was concluded was he at liberty to return to us. After being in feeble health for some time he succumbed to acute pneumonia. His grave is in Leipzig. My youngest sons are still alive. The elder, Hermann, holds a position in the German "Credit Bank," and the younger, Friedrich (born September 3d, 1850), is licensed as a professor of Assyriology, and is at present (1883) working in the British Museum in London, where he is carrying on the preliminary studies necessary for the publication of an Assyrio-Babylonish lexicon.

On February 23d I completed my seventieth year. Although I hate all ovations, I was fêted more than I can tell you. Many blessings, too, were lavished on me, especially from missionary societies outside Germany, and these sounded sweetly in my ears—as sweetly as the cradle-song to the child when it is about to sleep.

### THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

BY W. W. ANDREWS, MINISTER.

From *The Independent*, New York, June 26, 1890.

IN your issue of June 5th, you speak of the extinction of the Sandemanians as an organized body, and after briefly sketching their history, and describing their peculiarities, you say, "One other kindred denomination, called the Catholic Apostolic Church, yet holds a dying existence in congregations in America, founded by Edward Irving, the friend of Coleridge, Chalmers and Carlyle, and the most brilliant preacher of his day."

From your words, it might be inferred that the congregations in America, forming a part of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," were founded by Edward Irving; that in them alone this body has now an existence; and that they are about to become extinct.

I beg permission as a minister in this communion, and one acquainted with the movement almost from the beginning, to state in few words the principal facts regarding its origin, and its present position.

It began in the revival of the supernatural gifts of the Holy Ghost in Scotland, in 1830, in members of the Presbyterian Church; and in London, in the following year, in members of the Anglican Communion. It was not in the congregation of Mr. Irving that these gifts first appeared, though when he became convinced that they were of God, he defended them with his great and peculiar powers of eloquence and argument, and gave liberty for their exercise in his own church. But he was never the founder of any ecclesiastical organization. When these supernatural manifestations burst forth, deeply agitating the religious world, he was simply a Presbyterian minister in charge of a congregation in Regent Square, London, and he fulfilled no other ministry till after his deposition for alleged heresy as to the Human Nature of Christ, by the Scotch Presbytery of Ayr, of which he was a member.



ny seven-  
ations, I  
t. Many  
me, espe-  
side Ger-  
a my ears  
the child

LIC

ER.

1890.

speak of  
as an  
sketching  
peculiar-  
denom-  
postolic  
in con-  
Edward  
halmers  
preacher

inferred  
forming  
urch,"  
that in  
istence;  
xtinct;  
is com-  
e move-  
state in  
ling its

natural  
n 1830,  
church;  
year, in  
on. It  
Irving  
when  
of God,  
pecul-  
at, and  
is own  
nder of  
a these  
forth,  
he was  
arge of  
ondon,  
l after  
to the  
Scotch  
mem-

But before this, an important step had been taken, by which the whole character of the movement was defined. Toward the close of 1832, after many Christian people of all ranks and all professions had become satisfied that the Holy Ghost was speaking again in tongues and prophesying, it pleased God to revive the Apostolic office, the first and highest in the primitive Church, but which had long been suspended in its exercise. One had already been called to this office by the voice of the Spirit (as in the case of Barnabas and Saul at Antioch), when Mr. Irving was deposed. This act, unjust as it was, was recognized as within the range of the constitutional powers of the Presbytery, and he was directed by the Apostle, whom he received as divinely called, to abstain from the administration of sacraments till he should be re-ordained, which was done a very few days after.

Mr. Irving, therefore, so far from being a founder of churches, and the head of a new ecclesiastical organization, was under the authority of the Presbyterian Church, till he was cast out of its communion, and then came under the spiritual rule of one whom he recognized as clothed with apostolic authority. From this time till his death, which took place in December, 1834, he was no more than the chief pastor of the church to which he had ministered as a Presbyterian clergyman, and which had followed him when he was driven from the stately walls and towers of Regent Square, because he would not restrain the utterances of the Holy Ghost.

There was never a more groundless charge than this making of Edward Irving to be the leader of a new sect. The two chief features of this spiritual movement are the revival of Apostleship and Prophecy; the latter being prior in time. But Mr. Irving was neither a prophet nor an apostle. He laid claim to no supernatural gift, wonderful as his spiritual endowments were; nor was he called to the apostolic office. As a preacher, an evangelist, his powers were of the mightiest; but he organized no party, he formulated no creed, he instituted no forms of worship. The majestic church system, which has grown up within the last half century, has not been of his framing. He bore a powerful witness to many great truths pertaining to the Incarnation, the Kingdom of Christ, and the work of the Holy Ghost; but the organizing of a new religious community was no work of his.

Nor are these churches "holding a dying existence," in America or Europe. They were never so numerous as to-day. The

movement has extended into most of the Protestant, and some of the Roman Catholic, countries of Europe and into Russia, besides the congregations among the English-speaking people of America, and in Australia. But their increase has certainly been slow; and they form at this day one of the smallest bodies of the Christian Church. Their relation to the whole company of Christ's flock is expressed (as we believe) by the symbol of the sheaf of *first-fruits*, which was numerically small as compared with the *harvest*, but in which the first full ripening of the grain took place. The work of preparation for the coming of Christ begins in a small company, where it can most easily and effectually be carried on; and afterward He delivers the innumerable multitude of the faithful who stand in white robes, and with palms in their hands (Rev. vii), singing the song of victory before the throne of God.

It is this plainly Scriptural distinction between first-fruits and harvest, which shows how this movement can be at once circumscribed in its activities, and Catholic in its spirit and aims. We look upon ourselves not as *the* Church, but as a small part of the one flock of Christ to *all* of whom the name "Catholic Apostolic" belongs equally with ourselves. We have constructed no new creed, but have remained content with the three great creeds of Christendom—the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian. We have not cut ourselves loose from the past, in the worship of the Church, but have preserved and formed into a harmonious system all that is purest and most truly Catholic in all the Rituals of Christendom—Greek, Roman, and Protestant; we cherish the one hope of the early Church, the coming and kingdom of Christ, and look for no regeneration of human society before it; we claim liberty for the Holy Ghost to manifest Himself in gifts and the powers of the world to come, according as He will; we look upon Christianity as having for its present mission the sanctifying of all the relationships of human life and the foreshadowing of the glory of the kingdom, though the curse still remains on man and the earth; and we sternly resist the spirit of unbelief which rejects the mysteries of Revelation, and the lawless spirit which despises and defies authority.

The movement is one which presents the strongest claims to the attention of the whole Christian Church; for it gathers into itself the excellences of every part, and presents a miniature model of what Christ would have His Church to be, in the fulness of its faith, in the brightness of the heavenly hope,

in the comprehensiveness and beauty of its worship, in the completeness of its structure, and in the order and harmony of its workings.

It is a work for the time of the end, as was John the Baptist's. We do not expect it to continue for generations. It is no rival sect struggling for a foothold side by side with other sects, but the rising up in the midst of all of a living witness for unity and holiness, and the manifested power of the Holy Ghost; no alien and hostile body, but a living part instinct with the Spirit, and obedient to the law, of the whole, and furnished anew with the long-lost ministries which the common welfare imperatively demands.

WETHERSFIELD, CONN.

### THE SHORT-CUT TO THE MINISTRY.

BY A "SHORT-CUT" MAN.

From *The Watchman* (Baptist), Boston, June 26, 1890.

THERE has been of late earnest discussion of a matter vital to the Baptist Christian ministry—a discussion calculated to stimulate men to the most thorough preparation for the work of preaching. Rochester Theological Seminary has decided not to receive pupils unable to pursue the Greek or Hebrew course. Other theological schools of our denomination furnish the "English Course," but strongly urge that the students be prepared to take the full course, for the sake of proficiency in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. There is no danger that too much learning will render a man insane in his ministerial work. The training afforded by competent teachers in college or in theological seminary, the acquired resources of science and history and the languages, equip a person none too well for preaching. The Christian ministry is worthy of the finest attainments, and demands them. Lemuel Haynes, at one time hearing a man boldly assert that ministers were more useful without classical or theological education, silenced him by the sharp question, "How much ignorance do you think is necessary to constitute a successful preacher?"

But it is a prominent fact in our denominational history—it seems a decree of Providence—that earnest and capable "short-cut" men (what a convenient term!) have been assigned responsible labor in the ministry, and have done their work well. They would gladly have taken the full course, but because of sufficient reasons, this was im-

possible. Yet their call to the ministry seemed imperative, God giving them no peace day or night until the pledge was sealed. Four proofs are offered that a man is ordained of the Lord to the ministry: 1. That he wants to preach; 2. That he can preach; 3. That the people like to hear him preach; 4. That he is successful in his work. There are many of the "short-cut" men who fulfil these conditions. They are good English scholars, and some of them understand other languages. They have been lawyers or teachers, or writers for newspapers. Their intellectual discipline has been thorough. They proclaim the truths of the Bible systematically, clearly and forcibly. They are determined to do the best work possible, that God may be honored, the spiritual interests of men advanced, and that the "long-cut" graduates need not blush because of their incompetency.

About one in four or five of our Baptist pastors has not taken the full collegiate and theological course. Yet in this class are found men deeply pious and some of signal ability. What if our State Legislature could and should pass a law that all non-graduates shall leave the ministry? It would be a decree worse than death to us who are all absorbed in our holy work. But would it not prove a very bad policy, because that apparently God has not ordered it so? He hath chosen, both in the past and present, to put side by side the finest scholar and the one of more limited education. And these two work harmoniously in all spiritual, intellectual and loving relations for the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom. Education alone will not fit a man for the ministry. Other qualities of soul and disposition are needed, and are often found to a marked degree in the one whose scholarship is comparatively inferior. But as one of the "short-cut" class, I bear cheerful testimony to the almost un failing courtesy and help and encouragement received from the full graduates. They are patient concerning our faults, bestow all the honors on us that we deserve, and rejoice in our solid advancement. They measure us according to what *we are* and what we *accomplish*, and not chiefly by our educational advantages. We have no right to find fault with such honest testing.

But the "short-cut" man must possess untiring ambition. He must not expect to be coddled like an infant. He has his own destiny to hew out by patient and continuous strokes. He must prove himself, in the noblest sense, a digger. The fact that he has not taken the full course should goad

him year by year to the severest mental labor and acquisition. If he is strong and persevering, he may attain almost anything in his profession in theology or science or history. Such works are to be had giving the best thought in the clearest English. It will be his own fault if he goes limping. If he is *lazy*, we say, Stay out of the ministry; we have too many of that sort now. We do not want the man in our ranks who is supremely satisfied to be "a bolt of nothing shot at nothing."

Perhaps the writer will be pardoned if he outlines somewhat the course of study that he has pursued. He abhors, as every faithful student must, mere book cramming. He has compared author with author, has sought to analyze and synthesize thought, and to test all religious teaching by Scripture statement. He has followed Hodge, Dwight and Augustus H. Strong in Systematic Theology; Horne's "Introduction to the Bible"; Dean Stanley, Edersheim and Schaff in Church History; Farrar, Geikie, Andrews, Weiss and Edersheim on the Life of Christ; Geology by Dana and Le Conte; Astronomy by Newcomb; and the Ocean and Atmosphere by Reclus. Good commentaries, reliable histories, works of poetry and of fiction are familiar companions in his daily work. He has carefully read Bushnell and Newman Smythe and Charles Briggs, that he might know all their truth and heresy. He has sought in the midst of theological conflict to form a sufficient reason for his own faith, and out of the clashing of ideas to bring forth thoughts and principles loyal to God's Word. His library, volume by volume, has been made a part of himself. How dear to his soul are the patient books that submit to any usage, and never find fault, but cheerfully afford facts from all ages and lands! New books are constantly added to this store. These personal references are not intended as boasting—God forbid!—but to encourage others to do as well or better. The writer lashes himself because he has not accomplished greater things.

The "short-cut" man who knows but little at the beginning of his ministry, and is satisfied with such mental narrowness, deserves the contempt of the Church and of the world. It should be our pride and ambition to keep abreast of the times. There is nothing to hinder our doing this. We live in a peculiarly favored age. Good books seem as plenty as leaves on the trees, and scholarly men are ever ready to encourage and help. Persistent study will master all the facts that we need. If our growth does

not keep pace with the progress of the years, there is great personal fault. The non-graduate who sulks, keeping aloof from his best friends, the graduates, and who fills his life with sloth, will be served much the same as the drones in the hive. He deserves such treatment. It is fortunate that he never tried to go through college and theological seminary, for he would have known about as little at the close as at the beginning of his course, and have visited sorrow and mortification on the faithful professors. But if he is ambitious and consecrated, he will find strong helpers on all sides. The world demands preaching fresh, vigorous and practical. Sermons must contain something more than pious exhortations, amens and lamentations. We lose our audience except we furnish, Sunday by Sunday, sturdy thoughts as substantial mental and spiritual food. Can we "short-cut" men answer the requirements of the Gospel ministry of to-day? If not, we are in the wrong place, and should have the grace to resign our position. Paul's exhortation should always stimulate us: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The Head of the Church demands of His ministers a course long and thorough. Year by year their education is to progress. The "short-cut" men will be all we make ourselves, and no more. We shall be given as large places as we can fill, and no larger. The scales will tell our exact weight. Do we complain of and fight against such a law? We shall only bruise ourselves against the pitiless wall of fate. If we want higher honors, let us prove worthy of them by increased moral, spiritual and intellectual greatness.

## THE END OF SANDEMANIANISM.

From *The Examiner* (Baptist), New York, June 12, 1890.

To the average man, well-informed about most things, the name Sandemanian is quite as likely to suggest some new variety of insect as a religious sect. Most Americans have never met a person of this persuasion. The body originated among the Presbyterians of Scotland about 1728, at a time whose separatist tendencies are well illustrated by the tale of one to whose kirk nobody belonged but himself and his brother Sandy, and he "had doots o' Sandy's soundness." Combined with this crankiness of personal belief was a rabid intolerance of all who did not agree in the smallest details with the

particular system set forth; and as each "crank's" belief changed about as rapidly as the moon, the result was something bewildering. John Glas was the founder of the sect, and he began with opposition to an established church as unscriptural. His son-in-law, Robert Sandeman, was an abler and also a more erratic man. He became the leader of the sect, and in this country and in England it has always been called by his name.

The distinguishing theological feature of the sect was taught by Sandeman. It is that the faith of the New Testament is mere belief, an intellectual assent to the teaching of the apostles and Scripture. On this "faith" men are to be baptized. This principle was adopted by Alexander Campbell, and though some Disciples do not accept it as a full and satisfactory definition of faith, many Disciple preachers proclaim it in all of Sandeman's boldness. In this way the doctrine has been widely spread, but the Sandemanians themselves have never made much progress. This is largely due to certain peculiarities in their polity and practice. They professed to be very scrupulous in exactly following the New Testament order in all things, yet they practised aspersion. Their devotion to the original order was shown in celebrating the Lord's Supper every Lord's day; in holding a "love-feast" on Sundays between services; in practising foot-washing as a religious rite; in abstaining from blood and things strangled; and in practising a sort of communism like that of Acts 2:44, 45.

For some years there has been but one church of this faith and order in the United States. Robert Sandeman came to this country in 1764, and first founded a church at Danbury, Conn. Other congregations founded by him and others have passed away, but this one has continued until now. But four women remain, the youngest of whom is sixty years of age, and the property is to be sold and the church formally dissolved. It is rather an ignominious end of what might have been under other circumstances a great religious movement.

The chief hindrances to the growth of Sandemanianism were its crankiness and its inconsistency. Its doctrine of faith—though, as we believe, profoundly erroneous—was no obstacle to progress, and was, indeed, favorable to rapid growth, as it dispensed with all need of moral conversion. Its principle of faithfulness to the New Testament was also a popular principle, as well as a true one. This principle was, however, carried out in an obviously inconsistent

and freaky way. A sect that is so careful to follow Christ's example as to make foot-washing a religious ordinance, while yet it refuses to be buried with Christ in baptism, commits suicide at the outset. To tithe mint, anise, and cumin, and yet to neglect the weightier matters of the law may make a good Pharisee, superbly conscious of his own righteousness, but it does not deceive a shrewd world. A cause so weighted runs a losing race, and the day of its absolute failure may be postponed, but cannot be avoided.

### EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston, June 12, 1890.

WE do not propose to enter upon a theological controversy with the Boston *Transcript*, for the same reason which led Plato to decline arguing with one who had not the temper of a philosopher, but was only a partisan—"for the partisan when he is engaged in a dispute cares nothing about the rights of the question, but is anxious only to convince his hearers of his own assertions." That journal insists that "a very large proportion of the members" of the Orthodox churches, as a matter of fact, do not accept the doctrine of "everlasting" future punishment, and accuses those churches of "dishonesty" in retaining the statement of it in their creeds. In support of this flagrant charge it adduces two proofs, viz.: (1) that "many of the most reliable, well-informed and well-known members of Orthodox churches do not tell the truth" if it be not so; and (2) that "one of the most distinguished pastors of one of the largest Orthodox Congregationalist churches of this city said, some time since, 'We have got to give up our eternal punishment.'"

It would strike some minds as being a little hasty to accuse five thousand Christian churches, and as many ministers, of absolute "dishonesty," on the judgment of a dozen or two persons—more or fewer—whose assurances have been given to this editor, with the added impression of a single minister, who does not, it seems, assert that the doctrine has already passed out of the general belief, but only that "we have got to give it up;" but the kind of religious "liberality" which is regnant in the *Transcript* office is quite equal to any such little *non sequitur* as that.

As we said, we do not intend to argue the question, but merely to state, as fairly and as frankly as we can, what we understand the facts to be, and leave the subject there.



We understand it to be true, in the first place, that the Orthodox churches no longer interpret that imagery, through which the Scripture sets forth the condition of the finally impenitent, with that literalness which once was common to the whole Christian world. They hold it to be spiritually rather than materially suggestive—the literal fire and worm standing for some painful condition of the soul. Had the *Transcript* taken the trouble carefully to read that article written by Dr. Phelps, over which it persistently howls, it would have discovered that his contention for more frequent recurrence in the modern pulpit to the imagery of the Scriptures with regard to the future and final effects of sin, is not in favor of the idea that those awful threats are to come upon the lost soul in their literal sense, but only that it is fair to think there must be wrapped up in their tremendous word-painting some psychical dangers of which our modern thought risks too little regard.

And, in the second place, we understand it to be true that the Orthodox churches have felt the effect, with other Evangelical bodies, of that drift of the public mind away from what used to be known distinctively as "doctrinal," toward what it has been more common to call "practical," preaching. It is true that the doctrine of eternal punishment is not as often as formerly distinctively taught as a doctrine. But it is equally true that the existence of God, inspiration, the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, sin and its exceeding sinfulness, the atonement, regeneration, justification, sanctification, the perseverance of the saints, the glory of heaven, and many other of the vilest and sublimest truths of our theology, are not now taught lecture-wise as they formerly were. But this is not because they do not enter into our current religious belief and life as really as they used to do; but because it is the preference of our day to reach all such subjects from their executive rather than their theoretic side; and to comprehend, illustrate and emphasize them rather in their relation to the living and working of Christian principles as exemplified in the life of Christ, than after a mere theoretical and purely theological fashion.

As thus explained we do most sincerely believe that the great body of the Orthodox churches and ministry continue firmly to hold substantially to the theology of our fathers as to the eternal issues of our earthly life. As directly involved through their relation to the National Council, their faith on this subject is stated thus: "the final judgment, the issues of which are eternal

life and everlasting punishment." As indirectly worded through the Creed Commission of that Council, it is: "in a final judgment, the issues of which are everlasting punishment and everlasting life."

Orthodox believers receive the Bible as a revelation from God, and meekly accept its teachings as their only safe guide into the unknown. To them Scripture says that the future punishment of the finally impenitent will be without end. As to this they do not fight against God. They do not pretend to understand its mysteries. They are not careful to justify it to human unreason. But, meekly accepting what to them is the divine voice, they try so to live that the question will never become, in their experience, a practical one; and so to purify and hallow human society that for all men such questions—like the beams of the morning star—may melt away into the light of heaven.

#### THE PROGRESS OF THE NEGRO.\*

BY REV. ATTICUS G. HAYGOOD, D.D.,  
BISHOP OF THE SOUTHERN METHODIST  
EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

From *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), Boston, June 19, 1890.

1. THE colored population is believed to be about seven millions. The great mass is made up of pure-blood negroes. Those who think that all negroes are black mistake the case: the larger part are brown people. The hair more than the skin determines the race status of these wonderful people. It is absolutely settled that the tendencies against miscegenation increase in both races. Fewer mulattoes are born each year. The moral tone of the negroes does improve: the white man recoils from amalgamation more than in former days, and law teaches all. If one should look only for the bad, he can find facts enough to satisfy him that my views are all wrong and my hopes all delusive.

2. The negro race in the South makes progress upward. The barbarous moral debasement of many of them may be admitted without weakening the statement that there is a real uplift. At least two millions of them can read. The American people have too much faith in education to put a light estimate upon such facts. Moreover, not less than one million of these people are now at school. There are more than sixteen thousand common schools for negro youth

\* A communication read at the Lake Mohonk Conference for the Negro, June 5, 1890.

in the Southern States, supported out of the public money for elementary education. These schools are taught by negro teachers with hardly an exception, the teachers having been taught mostly in the higher institutions maintained by Northern benevolence, largely in normal schools aided by the State governments. These are not ideal schools; but they are as good as the conditions of the case allow, and they steadily grow better. Many of them are better than many schools for white children, because their teachers are, many of them, better trained than many white teachers are trained.

In law the negro children share equally with white children: in fact, the negro children receive more and more benefit from the public school systems in the South. Much of whatever inequality there may be grows out of the condition of the colored people themselves. It is not strange that a race so circumstanced fails to secure the best results from their schools. The negroes are as determined to teach their public schools as Southern white people are not to teach them. Indeed, the negroes show so marked a desire to control the colleges built for their benefit that their best friends are anxious lest the impatience of the very people they labor for should mar their best-planned efforts to help them. One proof that elementary education among the negroes grows better is this: those who apply for admission into the higher schools come better prepared each year. This should be so; for the teachers of the primary schools each year show a larger number who have received training in the higher schools. And the higher schools with improving material do better work, year by year. One most important and cheering proof of the gradual betterment of the negro population I have found in my long-continued studies of the subject: the children of parents who had training a decade or two ago begin on a higher plane. Of this there can be no doubt.

3. The present educational movement in the Southern States is toward longer terms for the public schools for both races. For nearly ten years the white people, who pay nearly all the taxes, have been contented to divide the school moneys according to population, without respect to race or previous conditions. Not every white man was content with this, but it was the universally accepted law in the case. At this time, while there is no concerted movement to change the method of distribution, there is an unmistakable tendency that way. As to the causes leading this way I may be mistaken,

but I believe that I state it correctly: (1) this tendency manifested itself coincidentally with the talk of Congressional action as to overseeing elections; (2) during the last two years particularly some prominent negro leaders—editors and politicians—have been extremely unwise in their public utterances. It is true that the relations of the two races in the South are more strained than for years past.

4. A great work has been attempted, and great results have been achieved. In carrying on the higher schools, Northern benevolence has expended about sixteen millions of dollars, and hundreds of good men and women have expended themselves. This benevolence has been magnificent, this personal consecration sublime. In carrying on the public schools and in aiding normal schools, the Southern States have expended considerably over forty millions. This is a most creditable showing. Considering the conditions that followed the war and the poverty of the Southern people for the twenty years following the war, it is extraordinary.

No poor and illiterate people ever received so much help during twenty-five years, as no such people ever made such progress before during the same length of time. Not a few worthy people seem so impatient to have done with this work that they cannot be grateful for the great results that have been achieved. As to the best method of helping them, experienced people gravely question whether direct aid—as money given without any conditions—is not more hurtful than beneficial. The money that most aids them is money earned. The approved method now is to give aid for work actually done. This plan secures them the money, and develops self-respect and tends toward self-support.

5. The essential goodness of industrial training in connection with the ordinary school training is now universally admitted by experienced and practical people. In the schools aided by the Slater Fund during the school year 1889-90, as many as ten thousand young people were taught in books and in some branch of useful industries. This sort of training is vital now. Mere book-schooling with poor and illiterate people breeds wants faster than it develops ability to provide for them: the outcome is misery. Tool-craft helps to realize the aspirations that book-learning inspires.

6. The dangers grow out of the facts. Many white people North are unduly impatient; many white people South are unduly anxious; many colored people do not sufficiently realize how much has been done for

them and achieved by them to be patient with conditions that cannot be changed at once, or to be happy in the hopes that are born of gratitude to the God who has led them.

### MINISTERS' SALARIES.

From *The Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch), New York, June 18, 1890.

"A CONSTANT READER" writes to the *Intelligencer*, prompted by the recent editorial on "The Ministry and Well-to-Do Families," asking, "Can you tell me what is the average salary of our city ministers, and what is the usual amount given by the majority of fairly well-to-do churches to acceptable and useful pastors?" Our correspondent also had listened a few days before "to pretty strong assertions in regard to the high salaries paid city ministers and the consequent inducements to enter the ministry from worldly motives." The brief letter also suggests that these large salaries are "perhaps what a man of equal ability might earn in a profession—for argument's sake, let us admit more."

The range of ministers' salaries in this city is wide, being from \$3500 to \$17,000 and a house, the latter being the equivalent of about \$20,000 a year. But the large sums are paid to a decided minority of the city pastors. The majority probably do not average above an annual income of about \$6000. Out of this must be paid for house rent from \$2000 to \$2500. Names cannot be mentioned, but the preachers receiving the large salaries, if they had devoted themselves to the law, would probably earn from \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year. In the medical profession their fees would not fall short probably of from \$25,000 to \$30,000. They are men not only of eminent mental ability and acuteness, but also are endowed with superior judgment and executive ability. Besides, in the professions, as they grow old, their incomes would continue; but in the ministry they frequently decline. At threescore and ten the legal opinion of a learned lawyer is often cheap at any price. It is not so with a pastor, in public opinion.

In Brooklyn and neighboring cities the salaries of pastors are much below those paid in New York, and would probably average about \$4000, with a much greater probability of a large decline in old age.

The average salary of a pastor in our own Church, outside of the cities, is about \$800 and a parsonage. If well-to-do churches only are taken into the reckoning the aver-

age would be somewhere between \$1200 to \$1500 a year. And the general average in our Church is rather higher than that in other denominations.

It does not seem to us that many men are induced by "worldly motives" to enter the ministry. Our experience does not warrant that conclusion. Our knowledge of the men has formed the conviction that they serve as pastors with considerable self-sacrifice, and elected their profession through a sincere desire to serve the Lord and Redeemer and to minister to the welfare of men.

### PARAGRAPHIC.

REV. DR. TWITCHELL, of Hartford, Conn., on taking the chair to preside at an after-supper speech-making, recently, said: "On receiving the invitation, I asked my better half why she supposed I was called to this position, and she replied, 'Why, to get rid of you, I presume, and do be short.' This method is a very good one to try, but it doesn't always work, for one of my brother pastors in Hartford once told me in a ministers' meeting how much he suffered from an old brother who always made lengthy remarks. Undertaking to head him off, on one occasion, he said: 'Brother, will you please lead in prayer?' The brother arose, and said sadly: 'I was intending to make a few remarks; but perhaps I can throw them into the form of a prayer,' and he proceeded to do so."—*Christian Herald, Detroit*.

It is related of Pope Clement XIV. that, when he ascended the papal chair, the ambassadors of the several States represented at his court waited on him with their congratulations. When they were introduced and bowed, he returned the compliment by bowing also, on which the master of the ceremonies told his highness that he should not have returned their salute. "Oh, I beg your pardon," said the good pontiff; "I have not been Pope long enough to forget good manners."—*Christian Register, Boston*.

WHEN Lord Ellenborough was Lord Chief Justice, a laborer was once brought into court as a witness. When he came up to be sworn his lordship said to him: "Really, witness, when you have to appear before the court it is your bounden duty to be more clean and decent in your appearance." "Upon my life," said the witness, "if your lordship comes to that, I'm thinking I'm every bit as well dressed as your lordship." "What do you mean, sir?" asked his lordship, angrily. "Why, faith," said the laborer, "you come here in your working clothes, and I come in mine."—*Presbyterian Journal, Philadelphia*.

THE Persian author, Saadi, tells a story of three sages—a Greek, an Indian, and a Persian—who, in the presence of the Persian monarch, debated this question: Of all evils incident to humanity, which is the greatest? The Grecian declared, "Old age oppressed with poverty;" the Indian answered, "Pain with impatience;" while the Persian, bowing low, made answer, "The greatest evil, oh king, that I can conceive is the couch of death without one good deed of life to light the darksome way!"

## IX.

## AGNOSTICISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY PROFESSOR THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

(Continued from the July number, p. 247.)

supposed by the reader to be intended for a true version of what Herod said. In the "Antiquities," written some seventeen years later, the same writer gives another report, also in the first person, of Herod's speech on the same occasion. This second oration is twice as long as the first, and though the general tenor of the two speeches is pretty much the same, there is hardly any verbal identity, and a good deal of matter is introduced into the one which is absent from the other. Now Josephus prides himself on his accuracy; people whose fathers might have heard Herod's oration were his contemporaries; and yet his historical sense is so curiously undeveloped, that he can, quite innocently, perpetuate an obvious literary fabrication; for one of the two accounts must be incorrect. Now, if I am asked whether I believe that Herod made some particular statement on this occasion; whether, for example, he uttered the pious aphorism, "Where God is, there is both multitude and courage," which is given in the "Antiquities," but not in the "Wars," I am compelled to say I do not know. One of the two reports must be erroneous, possibly both are: at any rate, I can not tell how much of either is true. And, if some fervent admirer of the Idumean should build up a theory of Herod's piety upon Josephus's evidence that he propounded the aphorism, is it a "mere evasion" to say, in reply, that the evidence that he did utter it is worthless?

It appears again that, adopting the tactics of Conachar when brought face to face with Hal o' the Wynd, I have been trying to get my simple-minded adversary to follow me on a wildgoose chase through the early history of Christianity, in the hope of escaping impending defeat on the main issue. But I may be permitted to point out that there is an alternative hypothesis which equally fits the facts; and that, after all, there may have been method in the madness of my supposed panic.

For suppose it to be established that Gentile Christianity was a totally different thing from the Nazarenism of Jesus and his immediate disciples; suppose it to be demonstrable that, as early as the sixth decade of our era at least, there were violent divergencies of opinion among the followers of

Jesus; suppose it to be hardly doubtful that the Gospels and the Acts took their present shapes under the influence of these divergencies; suppose that their authors, and those through whose hands they passed, had notions of historical veracity not more eccentric than those which Josephus occasionally displays—surely the chances that the Gospels are altogether trustworthy records of the teachings of Jesus become very slender. And as the whole of the case of the other side is based on the supposition that they are accurate records (especially of speeches, about which ancient historians are so curiously loose), I really do venture to submit that this part of my argument bears very seriously on the main issue; and, as ratiocination, is sound to the core.

Again, when I passed by the topic of the speeches of Jesus on the cross, it appears that I could have had no other motive than the dictates of my native evasiveness. An ecclesiastical dignitary may have respectable reasons for declining a fencing-match "in sight of Gethsemane and Calvary"; but an ecclesiastical "infidel"! Never. It is obviously impossible that, in the belief that "the greater includes the less," I, having declared the Gospel evidence in general, as to the sayings of Jesus, to be of questionable value, thought it needless to select, for illustration of my views, those particular instances which were likely to be most offensive to persons of another way of thinking. But any supposition that may have been entertained that the old familiar tones of the ecclesiastical war-drum will tempt me to engage in such needless discussion had better be renounced. I shall do nothing of the kind. Let it suffice that I ask my readers to turn to the twenty-third chapter of Luke (revised version), verse thirty-four, and he will find in the margin

Some ancient authorities omit: And Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

So that, even as late as the fourth century, there were ancient authorities, indeed some of the most ancient and weightiest, who either did not know of this utterance, so often quoted as characteristic of Jesus, or did not believe it had been uttered.

Many years ago, I received an anonymous letter, which abused me heartily for my want of moral courage in not speaking out. I thought that one of the oddest charges an anonymous letter-writer could bring. But I am not sure that the plentiful sowing of the pages of the article with which I am dealing with accusations of evasion, may not seem odder to those who consider that the main



strength of the answers with which I have been favored (in this review and elsewhere) is devoted not to anything in the text of my first paper, but to a note which occurs at page 171.\* In this I say :

Dr. Wace tells us : " It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects." And he seems to think the question appropriately answered by the assertion that it " ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case."

I requested Dr. Wace to point out the passages of M. Renan's works, in which, as he affirms, this " practical surrender" (not merely as to the age and authorship of the Gospels, be it observed, but as to their historical value) is made, and he has been so good as to do so. Now let us consider the parts of Dr. Wace's citation from Renan which are relevant to the issue :

The author of this Gospel [Luke] is certainly the same as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. Now the author of the Acts seems to be a companion of St. Paul—a character which accords completely with St. Luke. I know that more than one objection may be opposed to this reasoning ; but one thing, at all events, is beyond doubt, namely, that the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts is a man who belonged to the second apostolic generation ; and this suffices for our purpose.

This is a curious " practical surrender of the adverse case." M. Renan thinks that there is no doubt that the author of the third Gospel is the author of the Acts—a conclusion in which I suppose critics generally agree. He goes on to remark that this person *seems* to be a companion of St. Paul, and adds that Luke was a companion of St. Paul. Then, somewhat needlessly, M. Renan points out that there is more than one objection to jumping, from such data as these, to the conclusion that " Luke" is the writer of the third Gospel. And, finally, M. Renan is content to reduce that which is " beyond doubt" to the fact that the author of the two books is a man of the second apostolic generation. Well, it seems to me that I could agree with all that M. Renan considers " beyond doubt" here, without surrendering anything, either " practically" or theoretically.

Dr. Wace (" Nineteenth Century," March, p. 363)† states that he derives the above citation from the preface of the fifteenth edition of the " Vie de Jésus." My copy of " Les Evangiles," dated 1877, contains a list of Renan's " Œuvres Complètes," at the head of which I find " Vie de Jésus," 15<sup>e</sup> édition. It is, therefore, a

later work than the edition of the " Vie de Jésus" which Dr. Wace quotes. Now " Les Evangiles," as its name implies, treats fully of the questions respecting the date and authorship of the Gospels ; and any one who desired, not merely to use M. Renan's expressions for controversial purposes, but to give a fair account of his views in their full significance, would, I think, refer to the later source.

If this course had been taken, Dr. Wace might have found some as decided expressions of opinion in favor of Luke's authorship of the third Gospel as he has discovered in " The Apostles." I mention this circumstance because I desire to point out that, taking even the strongest of Renan's statements, I am still at a loss to see how it justifies that large-sounding phrase " practical surrender of the adverse case." For, on p. 438 of " Les Evangiles," Renan speaks of the way in which Luke's " excellent intentions" have led him to torture history in the Acts ; he declares Luke to be the founder of that " eternal fiction which is called ecclesiastical history" ; and, on the preceding page, he talks of the " myth" of the Ascension—with its *mise en scène voulue*. At p. 435, I find " Luc, ou l'auteur quel qu'il soit du troisième Evangile" [Luke, or whoever may be the author of the third Gospel] ; at p. 280, the accounts of the Passion, the death and the resurrection of Jesus are said to be " peu historiques" [little historical] ; at p. 283, " La valeur historique du troisième Evangile est sûrement moindre que celles des deux premiers" [the historical value of the third Gospel is surely less than that of the first two].

A Pyrrhic sort of victory for orthodoxy this " surrender" ! And, all the while, the scientific student of theology knows that the more reason there may be to believe that Luke was the companion of Paul, the more doubtful becomes his credibility, if he really wrote the Acts. For, in that case, he could not fail to have been acquainted with Paul's account of the Jerusalem conference, and he must have consciously misrepresented it. We may next turn to the essential part of Dr. Wace's citation (" Nineteenth Century," p. 365)\* touching the first Gospel :

St. Matthew evidently deserves peculiar confidence for the discourses. Here are " the oracles"—the very notes taken while the memory of the instruction of Jesus was living and definite.

M. Renan here expresses the very general opinion as to the existence of a collection of " logia," having a different origin from the

text in which they are imbedded, in Matthew. "Notes" are somewhat suggestive of a shorthand writer, but the suggestion is unintentional, for M. Renan assumes that these "notes" were taken, not at the time of the delivery of the "logia," but subsequently, while (as he assumes) the memory of them was living and definite; so that, in this very citation, M. Renan leaves open the question of the general historical value of the first Gospel, while it is obvious that the accuracy of "notes," taken, not at the time of delivery, but from memory, is a matter about which more than one opinion may be fairly held. Moreover, Renan expressly calls attention to the difficulty of distinguishing the authentic "logia" from later additions of the same kind ("Les Evangiles," p. 201). The fact is, there is no contradiction here to that opinion about the first Gospel which is expressed in "Les Evangiles" (p. 175).

The text of the so-called Matthew supposes the pre-existence of that of Mark, and does little more than complete it. He completes it in two fashions—first, by the insertion of those long discourses which gave their chief value to the Hebrew Gospels; then by adding traditions of a more modern formation, results of successive developments of the legend, and to which the Christian consciousness already attached infinite value.

M. Renan goes on to suggest that besides "Mark," "pseudo-Matthew" used an Aramaic version of the Gospel originally set forth in that dialect. Finally, as to the second Gospel ("Nineteenth Century," p. 365):\*

He [Mark] is full of minute observations, proceeding, beyond doubt, from an eye-witness. There is nothing to conflict with the supposition that this eye-witness . . . was the apostle Peter himself, as Papias has it.

Let us consider this citation also by the light of "Les Evangiles":

This work, although composed after the death of Peter, was, in a sense, the work of Peter; it represents the way in which Peter was accustomed to relate the life of Jesus (p. 116).

M. Renan goes on to say that, as an historical document, the Gospel of Mark has a great superiority (p. 116), but Mark has a motive for omitting the discourses; and he attaches a "puerile importance" to miracles (p. 117). The Gospel of Mark is less a legend than a biography written with credulity (p. 118). It would be rash to say that Mark has not been interpolated and retouched (p. 120).

If any one thinks that I have not been warranted in drawing a sharp distinction between "scientific theologians" and "counsel for creeds"; or that my warning against the too ready acceptance of certain declarations as to the state of biblical criticism was needless; or that my anxiety as to the sense of the word "practical" was superfluous, let him compare the statement that M. Renan has made a "practical surrender of the adverse case" with the facts just set forth. For what is the adverse case? The question, as Dr. Wace puts it, is, "It may be asked how far can we rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects." It will be obvious that M. Renan's statements amount to an adverse answer—to a "practical" denial that any great reliance can be placed on these accounts. He does not believe that Matthew, the apostle, wrote the first Gospel; he does not profess to know who is responsible for the collection of "logia," or how many of them are authentic; though he calls the second Gospel the most historical, he points out that it is written with credulity, and may have been interpolated and retouched; and as to the author "quel qu'il soit" of the third Gospel, who is to "rely on the accounts" of a writer who deserves the cavalier treatment which "Luke" meets with at M. Renan's hands?

I repeat what I have already more than once said, that the question of the age and the authorship of the Gospels has not, in my judgment, the importance which is so commonly assigned to it; for the simple reason that the reports, even of eye-witnesses, would not suffice to justify belief in a large and essential part of their contents; on the contrary, these reports would discredit the witnesses. The Gadarene miracle, for example, is so extremely improbable, that the fact of its being reported by three, even independent, authorities could not justify belief in it unless we had the clearest evidence as to their capacity as observers and as interpreters of their observations. But it is evident that the three authorities are not independent; that they have simply adopted a legend, of which there were two versions; and instead of their proving its truth, it suggests their superstitious credulity; so that, if "Matthew," "Mark," and "Luke" are really responsible for the Gospels, it is not the better for the Gadarene story, but the worse for them.

A wonderful amount of controversial capital has been made out of my assertion in the note to which I have referred, as an *obiter dictum* of no consequence to my argument,

that, if Renan's work \* were non-extant, the main results of biblical criticism as set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example, would not be sensibly affected. I thought I had explained it satisfactorily already, but it seems that my explanation has only exhibited still more of my native perversity, so I ask for one more chance.

In the course of the historical development of any branch of science, what is universally observed is this: that the men who make epochs and are the real architects of the fabric of exact knowledge are those who introduce fruitful ideas or methods. As a rule, the man who does this pushes his idea or his method too far; or, if he does not, his school is sure to do so, and those who follow have to reduce his work to its proper value, and assign it its place in the whole. Not unfrequently they, in their turn, overdo the critical process, and, in trying to eliminate errors, throw away truth.

Thus, as I said, Linnaeus, Buffon, Cuvier, Lamarck, really "set forth the results" of a developing science, although they often heartily contradict one another. Notwithstanding this circumstance, modern classificatory method and nomenclature have largely grown out of the results of the work of Linnaeus; the modern conception of biology, as a science, and of its relation to climatology, geography, and geology, are as largely rooted in the results of the labors of Buffon; comparative anatomy and paleontology owe a vast debt to Cuvier's results; while invertebrate zoology and the revival of the idea of evolution are intimately dependent on the results of the work of Lamarck. In other words, the main results of biology up to the early years of this century are to be found in, or spring out of, the works of these men.

So, if I mistake not, Strauss, if he did not originate the idea of taking the mythopœic faculty into account in the development of the Gospel narratives; and, though he may have exaggerated the influence of that faculty, obliged scientific theology hereafter to take that element into serious consideration; so Baur, in giving prominence to the cardinal fact of the divergence of the Nazarene and Pauline tendencies in the primitive Church; so Reuss, in setting a marvelous example of the cool and dispassionate application of the principles of scientific criticism over the whole field of Scripture; so Volkmar, in his clear and forcible statement of the Nazarene limita-

tions of Jesus, contributed results of permanent value in scientific theology. I took these names as they occurred to me. Undoubtedly, I might have advantageously added to them; perhaps I might have made a better selection. But it really is absurd to try to make out that I did not know that these writers widely disagree; and I believe that no scientific theologian will deny that, in principle, what I have said is perfectly correct. Ecclesiastical advocates, of course, can not be expected to take this view of the matter. To them, these mere seekers after truth, in so far as their results are unfavorable to the creed the clerics have to support, are more or less "infidels," or favorers of "infidelity"; and the only thing they care to see, or probably can see, is the fact that, in a great many matters, the truth-seekers differ from one another, and therefore can easily be exhibited to the public, as if they did nothing else; as if any one who referred to them, as having each and all contributed his share to the results of theological science, was merely showing his ignorance; and, as if a charge of inconsistency could be based on the fact that he himself often disagrees with what they say. I have never lent a shadow of foundation to the assumption that I am a follower of either Strauss, or Baur, or Reuss, or Volkmar, or Renan; my debt to these eminent men—so far my superiors in theological knowledge—is, indeed, great; yet it is not for their opinions, but for those I have been able to form for myself, by their help.

In "Agnosticism: a Rejoinder" (p. 96) I have referred to the difficulties under which those professors of the science of theology, whose tenure of their posts depends on the results of their investigations, must labor; and, in a note, I add:

Imagine that all our chairs of astronomy had been founded in the fourteenth century, and that their incumbents were bound to sign Ptolemaic articles. In that case, with every respect for the efforts of persons thus hampered to attain and expound the truth, I think men of common sense would go elsewhere to learn astronomy.

I did not write this paragraph without a knowledge that its sense would be open to the kind of perversion which it has suffered; but, if that was clear, the necessity for the statement was still clearer. It is my deliberate opinion: I reiterate it; and I say that, in my judgment, it is extremely inexpedient that any subject which calls itself a science should be intrusted to teachers who are debarred from freely following out scientific methods to their legitimate conclusions, whatever those conclusions may be. If I

\* I trust it may not be supposed that I undervalue M. Renan's labors or intended to speak slightly of them.

may borrow a phrase paraded at the Church Congress, I think it "ought to be unpleasant" for any man of science to find himself in the position of such a teacher.

Human nature is not altered by seating it in a professorial chair, even of theology. I have very little doubt that if, in the year 1859, the tenure of my office had depended upon my adherence to the doctrines of Cuvier, the objections to those set forth in the "Origin of Species" would have had a halo of gravity about them that, being free to teach what I pleased, I failed to discover. And, in making that statement, it does not appear to me that I am confessing that I should have been debarred by "selfish interests" from making candid inquiry, or that I should have been biased by "sordid motives." I hope that even such a fragment of moral sense as may remain in an ecclesiastical "infidel" might have got me through the difficulty; but it would be unworthy to deny or disguise the fact that a very serious difficulty must have been created for me by the nature of my tenure. And let it be observed that the temptation, in my case, would have been far slighter than in that of a professor of theology; whatever biological doctrine I had repudiated, nobody I cared for would have thought the worse of me for so doing. No scientific journals would have howled me down, as the religious newspapers howled down my too honest friend, the late Bishop of Natal; nor would my colleagues in the Royal Society have turned their backs upon me, as his episcopal colleagues boycotted him.

I say these facts are obvious, and that it is wholesome and needful that they should be stated. It is in the interests of theology, if it be a science, and it is in the interests of those teachers of theology who desire to be something better than counsel for creeds, that it should be taken to heart. The seeker after theological truth, and that only, will no more suppose that I have insulted him than the prisoner who works in fetters will try to pick a quarrel with me, if I suggest that he would get on better if the fetters were knocked off; unless, indeed, as it is said does happen in the course of long captivities, that the victim at length ceases to feel the weight of his chains or even takes to hugging them, as if they were honorable ornaments.\*

\* To-day's "Times" contains a report of a remarkable speech by Prince Bismarck, in which he tells the Reichstag that he has long given up investing in foreign stock, lest so doing should mislead his judgment in his transactions with foreign states. Does this declaration prove that the chancellor accuses himself of being "sordid" and "selfish," or does it not rather show that, even in dealing with himself, he remains the man of realities?

## X.

## "COWARDLY AGNOSTICISM."\*

## A WORD WITH PROF. HUXLEY.

BY W. H. MALLOCK.

I WELCOME the discussion which, in this review and elsewhere, has been lately revived in earnest as to the issue between positive science and theology. I especially welcome Prof. Huxley's recent contribution to it, to which presently I propose to refer in detail. In that contribution—an article with the title "Agnosticism," which appeared a month or two since in "The Nineteenth Century"—I shall point out things which will probably startle the public, the author himself included, in case he cares to attend to them.

Before going further, however, let me ask and answer this question. If Prof. Huxley should tell us that he does not believe in God, why should we think the statement, as coming from him, worthy of an attention which we certainly should not give it if made by a person less distinguished than himself? The answer to this question is as follows: We should think Prof. Huxley's statement worth considering for two reasons: Firstly, he speaks as a man pre-eminently well acquainted with certain classes of facts. Secondly, he speaks as a man eminent, if not pre-eminent, for the vigor and honesty with which he has faced these facts, and drawn certain conclusions from them. Accordingly, when he sums up for us the main conclusions of science, he speaks not in his own name, but in the name of the physical universe, as modern science has thus far apprehended it; and similarly, when from these conclusions he reasons about religion, the bulk of the arguments which he advances against theology are in no way peculiar to himself, or gain any of their strength from his reputation; they are virtually the arguments of the whole non-Christian world. He may possibly have, on some points, views peculiar to himself. He may also have certain peculiar ways of stating them. But it requires no great critical acuteness, it requires only ordinary fairness, to separate those of his utterances which represent facts generally accepted, and arguments generally influential, from those which represent only some peculiarity of his own. Now, all this is true not of Prof. Huxley only. With various qualifica-

\* "The Bishop of Peterborough departed so far from his customary courtesy and self-respect as to speak of 'cowardly agnosticism.'"—Prof. Huxley, p. 15.



tions, it is equally true of writers with whom Prof. Huxley is apparently in constant antagonism, and who also exhibit constant antagonism among themselves. I am at this moment thinking of two especially—Mr. Frederic Harrison and Mr. Herbert Spencer. Mr. Harrison, in his capacity of religious teacher, is constantly attacking both Mr. Spencer and Prof. Huxley. Prof. Huxley repays Mr. Harrison's blows with interest; and there are certain questions of a religious and practical character as to which he and Mr. Spencer would be hardly on better terms. But, underneath the several questions they quarrel about, there is a solid substructure of conclusions, methods, and arguments, as to which they all agree—agree in the most absolute way. What this agreement consists in, and what practical bearing, if taken by itself, it must have on our views of life, I shall now try to explain in a brief and unquestionable summary; and in that summary, what the reader will have before him is not the private opinion of these eminent men, but ascertained facts with regard to man and the universe; and the conclusions which, if we have nothing else to assist us, are necessarily drawn from those facts by the necessary operations of the mind. The mention of names, however, has this signal convenience—it will keep the reader convinced that I am not speaking at random, and will supply him with standards by which he can easily test the accuracy and the sufficiency of my assertions.

The case, then, of science, or modern thought, against theological religion or theism, and the Christian religion in particular, substantially is as follows:

In the first place, it is now an established fact that the physical universe, whether it ever had a beginning or no, is, at all events, of an antiquity beyond what the imagination can realize; and also that, whether or no it is limited, its extent is so vast as to be equally unimaginable. Science may not pronounce it absolutely to be either eternal or infinite, but science does say this, that so far as our faculties can carry us they reveal to us no hint of either limit, end, or beginning.

It is further established that the stuff out of which the universe is made is the same everywhere and follows the same laws—whether at Clapham Common or in the farthest system of stars—and that this has always been so to the remotest of the penetrable abysses of time. It is established yet further that the universe in its present condition has evolved itself out of simpler con-

ditions, solely in virtue of the qualities which still inhere in its elements, and make to-day what it is, just as they have made all yesterdays.

Lastly, in this physical universe science has included man—not alone his body, but his life and his mind also. Every operation of thought, every fact of consciousness, it has shown to be associated in a constant and definite way with the presence and with certain conditions of certain particles of matter, which are shown, in their turn, to be in their last analysis absolutely similar to the matter of gases, plants, or minerals. The demonstration has every appearance of being morally complete. The interval between mud and mind, seemingly so impassable, has been traversed by a series of closely consecutive steps. Mind, which was once thought to have descended into matter, is shown forming itself, and slowly emerging out of it. From forms of life so low that naturalists can hardly decide whether it is right to class them as plants or animals, up to the life that is manifested in saints, heroes, or philosophers, there is no break to be detected in the long process of development. There is no step in the process where science finds any excuse for postulating or even suspecting the presence of any new factor.

And the same holds good of the lowest forms of life, and what Prof. Huxley calls "the common matter of the universe." It is true that experimentalists have been thus far unable to observe the generation of the former out of the latter, but this failure may be accounted for in many ways, and does nothing to weaken the overwhelming evidence of analogy that such generation really does take place or has taken place at some earlier period. "Carbonic acid, water, and ammonia," says Prof. Huxley, "certainly possess no properties but those of ordinary matter. . . . But when they are brought together under certain conditions they give rise to protoplasm; and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomenon of life. I see no breach in this series of steps in molecular complication, and I am unable to understand why the language which is applicable to any one form of the series may not be used to any of the others."\*

So much, then, for what modern science teaches us as to the universe and the evolution of man. We will presently consider the ways, sufficiently obvious as they are, in which this seems to conflict with the ideas of all theism and theology. But first for a

\* "Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews," pp. 114, 117.

moment let us turn to what it teaches us also with regard to the history and the special claims of Christianity. Approaching Christianity on the side of its alleged history, it establishes the three following points: It shows us first that this alleged history, with the substantial truth of which Christianity stands or falls, contains a number of statements which are demonstrably at variance with fact; secondly, that it contains others which, though very probably true, are entirely misinterpreted through the ignorance of the writers who recorded them; and, thirdly, that though the rest may not be demonstrably false, yet those among them most essential to the Christian doctrine are so monstrously improbable and so utterly unsupported by evidence that we have no more ground for believing in them than we have in the wolf of Romulus.

Such, briefly stated, are the main conclusions of science in so far as they bear on theology and the theologic conception of humanity. Let us now consider exactly what their bearing is. Prof. Huxley distinctly tells us that the knowledge we have reached as to the nature of things in general does not enable us to deduce from it any absolute denial either of the existence of a personal God or of an immortal soul in man, or even of the possibility and the actual occurrence of miracles. On the contrary, he would believe to-morrow in the miraculous history of Christianity if only there were any evidence sufficiently cogent in its favor; and on the authority of Christianity he would believe in God and in man's immortality. Christianity, however, is the only religion in the world whose claims to a miraculous authority are worthy of serious consideration, and science, as we have seen, considers these claims to be unfounded. What follows is this—whether there be a God or no, and whether he has given us immortal souls or no, science declares bluntly that he has never informed us of either fact; and if there is anything to warrant any belief in either, it can be found only in the study of the natural universe. Accordingly, to the natural universe science goes, and we have just seen what it finds there. Part of what it finds bears specially on the theologic conception of God, and part bears specially on the theologic conception of man. With regard to God, to an intelligent creator and ruler, it finds him on every ground to be a baseless and a superfluous hypothesis. In former conditions of knowledge it admits that this was otherwise—that the hypothesis then was not only natural but necessary; for there were many seeming

mysteries which could not be explained without it. But now the case has been altogether reversed. One after another these mysteries have been analyzed, not entirely, but to this extent at all events, that the hypothesis of an intelligent creator is not only nowhere necessary, but it generally introduces far more difficulties than it solves. Thus, though we can not demonstrate that a creator does not exist, we have no grounds whatever for supposing that he does. With regard to man, what science finds is analogous. According to theology, he is a being specially related to God, and his conduct and his destinies have an importance which dwarfs the sum of material things into insignificance. But science exhibits him in a very different light; it shows that in none of the qualities once thought peculiar to him does he differ essentially from other phenomena of the universe. It shows that just as there are no grounds for supposing the existence of a creator, so there are none for supposing the existence of an immortal human soul; while as for man's importance relative to the rest of the universe, it shows that, not only as an individual, but also as a race, he is less than a bubble of foam is when compared with the whole sea. The few thousand years over which history takes us are as nothing when compared with the ages for which the human race has existed. The whole existence of the human race is as nothing when compared with the existence of the earth; and the earth's history is but a second and the earth but a grain of dust in the vast duration and vast magnitude of the All. Nor is this true of the past only, it is true of the future also. As the individual dies, so also will the race die; nor would a million of additional years add anything to its comparative importance. Just as it emerged out of lifeless matter yesterday, so will it sink again into lifeless matter to-morrow. Or, to put the case more briefly still, it is merely one fugitive manifestation of the same matter and force which, always obedient to the same unchanging laws, manifest themselves equally in a dung-heap, in a pig, and in a planet—matter and force which, so far as our faculties can carry us, have existed and will exist everywhere and forever, and which nowhere, so far as our faculties avail to read them, show any sign, as a whole, of meaning, of design, or of intelligence.

It is possible that Prof. Huxley, or some other scientific authority, may be able to find fault with some of my sentences or my expressions, and to show that they are not professionally or professorially accurate. If

they  
welc  
any  
and  
mean  
forep  
have  
and  
temp  
their  
Prof  
A  
whic  
but  
far  
aion  
for  
worl  
of n  
cons  
relig  
foll  
in t  
nam  
muc  
ties  
unit  
ever  
diffe  
than  
rath  
stan  
ther  
stan  
opp  
exh  
view  
thro  
Hu  
S  
Har  
of a  
or  
him  
by t  
not  
I w  
a m  
app  
the  
inte  
you  
And  
pret  
den  
the  
und  
vers  
stor  
M  
for  
gag

they care for such trifling criticism they are welcome to the enjoyment of it; but I defy any one to show, putting expression aside and paying attention only to the general meaning of what I have stated, that the foregoing account of what science claims to have established is not substantially true, and is not admitted to be so by any contemporary thinker who opposes science to theism, from Mr. Frederic Harrison to Prof. Huxley himself.

And now let us pass on to something which in itself is merely a matter of words, but which will bring what I have said thus far into the circle of contemporary discussion. The men who are mainly responsible for having forced the above views on the world, who have unfolded to us the verities of nature and human history, and have felt constrained by these to abandon their old religious convictions—these men and their followers have by common consent agreed, in this country, to call themselves by the name of agnostics. Now there has been much quarreling of late among these agnostics as to what agnosticism—the thing which unites them—is. It must be obvious, however, to every impartial observer, that the differences between them are little more than verbal, and arise from bad writing rather than from different reasoning. Substantially the meaning of one and all of them is the same. Let us take, for instance, the two who are most ostentatiously opposed to each other, and have lately been exhibiting themselves, in this and other reviews, like two terriers each at the other's throat. I need hardly say that I mean Prof. Huxley and Mr. Harrison.

Some writers, Prof. Huxley says, Mr. Harrison among them, have been speaking of agnosticism as if it was a creed or a faith or a philosophy. Prof. Huxley proclaims himself to be "dazed" and "bewildered" by the statements. Agnosticism, he says, is not any one of these things. It is simply—I will give his definition in his own words—

a method, the essence of which lies in the vigorous application of a single principle. . . . Positively, the principle may be expressed: In matters of the intellect, follow your reason as far as it will take you, without regard to any other consideration. And negatively: In matters of the intellect, do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable. That I take to be the agnostic faith, which if a man keep whole and undefiled, he shall not be ashamed to look the universe in the face, whatever the future may have in store for him.

Now anything worse expressed than this for the purpose of the discussion he is engaged in, or, indeed, for the purpose of con-

veying his own general meaning, it is hardly possible to imagine. Agnosticism, as generally understood, may, from one point of view, be no doubt rightly described as "a method." But is it a method with no results, or with results that are of no interest? If so, there would be hardly a human being idiot enough to waste a thought upon it. The interest resides in its results, and its results solely, and specially in those results that affect our ideas about religion. Accordingly, when the word agnosticism is now used in discussion, the meaning uppermost in the minds of those who use it is not a method, but the results of a method, in their religious bearings; and the method is of interest only in so far as it leads to these. Agnosticism means, therefore, precisely what Prof. Huxley says it does not mean. It means a creed, it means a faith, it means a religious or irreligious philosophy. And this is the meaning attributed to it not only by the world at large, but in reality by Prof. Huxley also quite as much as by anybody. I will not lay too much stress on the fact that, in the passage just quoted, having first fiercely declared agnosticism to be nothing but a method, in the very next sentence he himself speaks of it as a "faith." I will pass on to a passage that is far more unambiguous. It is taken from the same essay. It is as follows:

"Agnosticism [says Mr. Harrison] is a stage in the evolution of religion, an entirely negative stage, the point reached by physicists, a purely mental conclusion, with no relation to things social at all." I am [says Prof. Huxley] quite dazed by this declaration. Are there then any 'conclusions' that are not 'purely mental'? Is there no relation to things social in 'mental conclusions' which affect men's whole conception of life? . . . Agnosticism is a stage in the evolution of religion." If . . . Mr. Harrison, like most people, means by 'religion' theology, then, in my judgment, agnosticism can be said to be a stage in its evolution only as death may be said to be the final stage in the evolution of life."

Let us consider what this means. It means precisely what every one else has all along been saying, that agnosticism is to all intents and purposes a doctrine, a creed, a faith, or a philosophy, the essence of which is the negation of theologic religion. Now the fundamental propositions of theologic religion are these: There is a personal God, who watches over the lives of men; and there is an immortal soul in man, distinct from the flux of matter. Agnosticism, then, expressed in the briefest terms, amounts to two articles—not of belief, but of disbelief. *I do not believe in any God, personal, intelligent, or with a purpose; or, at least, with any purpose that has any concern with man.*

*I do not believe in any immortal soul, or in any personality or consciousness surviving the dissolution of the body.*

Here I anticipate from many quarters a rebuke, which men of science are very fond of administering. I shall be told that agnostics never say "there is no God," and never say "there is no immortal soul." Prof. Huxley is often particularly vehement on this point. He would have us believe that a dogmatic atheist is, in his view, as foolish as a dogmatic theist; and that an agnostic, true to the etymology of his name, is not a man who denies God, but who has no opinion about him. But this—even if true in some dim and remote sense—is for practical purposes a mere piece of solemn quibbling, and is utterly belied by the very men who use it whenever they raise their voices to speak to the world at large. The agnostics, if they shrink from saying that there is no God, at least tell us that there is nothing to suggest that there is one, and much to suggest that there is not. Surely, if they never spoke more strongly than this, for practical purposes this is an absolute denial. Prof. Huxley, for instance, is utterly unable to demonstrate that an evening edition of the "Times" is not printed in Sirius; but if any action depended on our believing this to be true, he would certainly not hesitate to declare that it was a foolish and fantastic falsehood. Who would think the better of him—who would not think the worse—if in this matter he gravely declared himself to be an agnostic? And precisely the same may be said of him with regard to the existence of God. For all practical purposes he is not in doubt about it. He denies it. I need not, however, content myself with my own reasoning. I find Prof. Huxley himself indorsing every word that I have just uttered. He declares that such questions as are treated of in volumes of divinity "are essentially questions of lunar politics, . . . not worth the attention of men who have work to do in the world": and he cites Hume's advice with regard to such volumes as being "most wise"—"Commit them to the flames, for they can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion."\* Quotations of a similar import might be indefinitely multiplied; but it will be enough to add to this the statements quoted already, that agnosticism is to theologic religion what death is to life; and that physiology does but deepen and complete the gloom of the gloomiest motto of paganism—"Debe-mur mortui." If then agnosticism is not an

absolute and dogmatic denial of the fundamental propositions of theology, it differs from an absolute and dogmatic denial in a degree that is so trivial as to be, in the words of Prof. Huxley himself, "not worth the attention of men who have work to do in the world." For all practical purposes and according to the real opinion of Prof. Huxley and Mr. Harrison equally, agnosticism is not doubt, is not suspension of judgment; but it is a denial of what "most people mean by religion"—that is to say, the fundamental propositions of theology, so absolute that Prof. Huxley compares it to their death.

And now let us pass on to the next point in our argument, which I will introduce by quoting Prof. Huxley again. This denial of the fundamental propositions of theology "affects," he says, "men's whole conception of life." Let us consider how. By the Christian world, life was thought to be important owing to its connection with some unseen universe, full of interests and issues which were too great for the mind to grasp at present, but in which, for good or evil, we should each of us one day share, taking our place among the awful things of eternity. But at the touch of the agnostic doctrine this unseen universe bursts like a bubble, melts like an empty dream; and all the meaning which it once imparted to life vanishes from its surface like mists from a field at morning. In every sense but one, which is exclusively physical, man is remorselessly cut adrift from the eternal; and whatever importance or interest anything has for any of us, must be derived altogether from the shifting pains or pleasures which go to make up our momentary span of life, or the life of our race, which in the illimitable history of the All is an incident just as momentary.

Now supposing the importance and interest which life has thus lost can not be replaced in any other way, will life really have suffered any practical change and degradation? To this question our agnostics with one consent say Yes. Prof. Huxley says that if theologic denial leads us to nothing but materialism, "the beauty of a life may be destroyed," and "its energies paralyzed";\* and that no one, not historically blind, "is likely to underrate the importance of the Christian faith as a factor in human history, or to doubt that some substitute genuine enough and worthy enough to replace it will arise."† Mr. Spencer says the same thing with even greater clearness: while, as for

\* "Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews," p. 125.

\* "Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews," p. 127.  
† Page 50.



Mr. Harrison, it is needless to quote from him; for half of what he has written is an amplification of these statements.

It is admitted, then, that life, in some very practical sense, will be ruined if science, having destroyed theologic religion, can not put, or allow to be put, some other religion in place of it. But we must not content ourselves with this general language. Life will be ruined, we say. Let us consider to what extent and how. There is a good deal in life which obviously will not be touched at all—that is to say, a portion of which is called the moral code. Theft, murder, some forms of lying and dishonesty, and some forms of sexual license, are inconsistent with the welfare of any society; and society, in self-defense, would still condemn and prohibit them, even supposing it had no more religion than a tribe of gibbering monkeys. But the moral code thus retained would consist of prohibitions only, and of such prohibitions only as could be enforced by external sanctions. Since, then, this much would survive the loss of religion, let us consider what would be lost along with it. Mr. Spencer, in general terms, has told us plainly enough. What would be lost, he says, is, in the first place, "our ideas of goodness, rectitude, or duty," or, to use a single word, "morality." This is no contradiction of what has just been said, for morality is not obedience, enforced or even instinctive, to laws which have an external sanction, but an active co-operation with the spirit of such laws, under pressure of a sanction that resides in our own wills. But not only would morality be lost, or this desire to work actively for the social good; there would be lost also every higher conception of what the social good or of what our own good is; and men would, as Mr. Spencer says, "become chiefly absorbed in the immediate and the relative."\* Prof. Huxley admits in effect precisely the same thing when he says that the tendency of systematic materialism is to "paralyze the energies of life," and "to destroy its beauty."

Let us try to put the matter a little more concisely. It is admitted by our agnostics that the most valuable element in our life is our sense of duty, coupled with obedience to its dictates; and this sense of duty derives both its existence and its power over us from religion, and from religion alone. How it derived them from the Christian religion is obvious. The Christian religion prescribed it to us as the voice of God to

the soul, appealing as it were to all our most powerful passions—to our fear, to our hope, and to our love. Hope gave it a meaning to us, and love and fear gave it a sanction. The agnostics have got rid of God and the soul together, with the loves, and fears, and hopes by which the two were connected. The problem before them is to discover some other considerations—that is, some other religion—which shall invest duty with the solemn meaning and authority derivable no longer from these. Our agnostics, as we know, declare themselves fully able to solve it. Mr. Spencer and Mr. Harrison, though the solution of each is different, declare not only that some new religion is ready for us, but that it is a religion higher and more efficacious than the old; while Prof. Huxley, though less prophetic and sanguine, rebukes those "who are alarmed lest man's moral nature be debased," and declares that a wise man like Hume would merely "smile at their perplexities."\*

Let us now consider what this new religion is—or rather these new religions, for we are offered more than one. So far as form goes, indeed, we are offered several. They can, however, all of them be resolved into two, resting on two entirely different bases, though sometimes, if not usually, offered to our acceptance in combination. One of these, which is called by some of its literary adherents Positivism or the Religion of Humanity, is based on two propositions with regard to the human race. The first proposition is that it is constantly though slowly improving, and will one day reach a condition thoroughly satisfactory to itself. The second proposition is that this remote consummation can be made so interesting to the present and to all intervening generations that they will strain every nerve to bring it about and hasten it. Thus, though humanity is admitted to be absolutely a fleeting phenomenon in the universe, it is presented relatively as of the utmost moment to the individual; and duty is supplied with a constant meaning by hope, and with a constant motive by sympathy. The basis of the other religion is not only different from this, but opposed to it. Just as this demands that we turn away from the universe, and concentrate our attention upon humanity, so the other demands that we turn away from humanity and concentrate our attention on the universe. Mr. Herbert Spencer calls this the Religion of the Un-

(To be continued.)

\* "Since the beginning, religion has had the all-essential office of preventing men from being chiefly absorbed in the relative or the immediate, and of awaking them to a consciousness of something beyond it."—"First Principles," p. 100.

\* "Lay Sermons," pp. 123, 124.

## GOODLY WORDS.

Readings from the Mystics, selected by C. H. A. BERNHARD, of the Astor Library.

In order to trace the ascending progression toward absolute unity of consciousness, of which even the most concentrated attention is but a very faint outline, we need not have recourse to probable hypotheses, nor need we proceed theoretically and *a priori*. I find in the "*Castillo interior*" of Saint Theresa a description, step by step, of this progressive concentration of consciousness, which, starting from the ordinary state of diffusion, assumes the form of attention, passes beyond the latter, and by degrees, in a few rare cases, attains to perfect unity of intuition. The observation deserves our fullest confidence. It is a confession made at the behest of the spiritual power, the work of a very delicate mind and a very able observer that well knew how to wield language to express the finest shades of thought.

There exists, says she, a castle built of a solitary diamond of matchless beauty and incomparable purity; to enter and to dwell in that castle is the supreme aim of the mystic. This castle is within us, within our soul; we have not to step out of our selves to penetrate its recesses; though, nevertheless, the road thereto is long and difficult. To reach it, we have to pass through seven stations: we enter the castle through the seven degrees of "prayer." In the preparatory stage we are still immersed in bewildering varieties of impressions and images—occupied with "the life of the world;" or, as I should prefer to translate it, consciousness still follows its usual and normal course.

The first objective point, or stage, is reached through "oral prayer." Which interpreted, means, that praying aloud, articulate speech in other words, produces the first degree of concentration, leading the dispersed consciousness into a single, confined channel.

The second stage is that of "mental prayer," which means that the inwardness of thought increases; internal language is substituted for external language. The work of concentration becomes easier; consciousness, to prevent aberration, no longer requires the material support of articulate or audible words; consciousness is now satisfied with a series of uncertain images unfolding before it.

The "prayer of recollection" (*oraison de recueillement*) marks the third stage. What this means, I must confess, slightly puzzles me. In this state I can only perceive a still higher form of the second period, separated from it by a very subtle shade, and appreciable only to the mystic consciousness.

Up to this point there has been activity, movement, and effort. All our faculties are still in play; now, however, it becomes necessary "no longer to think much, but to love much." In other words, consciousness is about to pass from the discursive form to the intuitive form, from plurality to unity; it tends no longer toward being a radiation around a fixed point, but a single state of enormous intensity. And this transition is not the effect of a capricious, arbitrary will, nor of the mere movement of thought left to itself; it needs the impulsion of a powerful love, the "touch of divine grace"—that is, the unconscious co-operation of the whole being.

The "prayer of quietude" brings us to the fourth station; there "the soul no longer produces, but receives;" this is a state of high contemplation, not exclusively known to religious mystics alone. It is

truth appearing suddenly in its totality, imposing itself as such, without the long, slow process of logical demonstration.

The fifth station, or "prayer of union," is the beginning of ecstasy; but it is unstable. It is "the meeting with the divine betrothed," but without lasting procession. "The flowers have but half opened their calyxes, they have only shed their first perfumes." The fixity of consciousness is not as yet complete, it is still liable to oscillations and deviations; as yet it is unable to maintain itself in this extraordinary, unnatural state.

Finally it attains to ecstasy in the sixth degree, through "the prayer of rapture." The body grows cold; speech and respiration are suspended, the eyes close; the slightest motion may cause the greatest efforts. . . . The senses and faculties remain without. . . . Although usually one does not lose all feeling (consciousness), still "*it has happened to me to be entirely deprived of it*"; this has seldom come to pass, and has lasted but for a short time. Most frequently, feeling is preserved, but one experiences an indefinable sort of agitation, and although one ceases to act outwardly, one does not fail to hear. It is like some confused sound, coming from afar. Still, "*even this manner of hearing ceases when the entrancement is at its highest point*."

What, then, is the seventh and last station that is reached by "the flight of the spirit?" What is there beyond ecstasy? Union with God. This is accomplished "suddenly and violently . . . but with such force that we should strive in vain to resist the impetuous onset." God has now descended into the substance of the soul, and becomes one with it.

TH. RIBOT, *The Psychology of Attention*. Authorized transl. by Open Court Publ. Co., Chicago, 1890.

## THE DIVINE DISCIPLINE FOR SANCTIFICATION.

It is sometimes the case that souls, in the experience of God's favor, are perverted by the very gifts which they receive from His hand. They mistake the gift for the Giver, the joy for Him who is the source of their joy. And God then, if He has determined to sanctify that soul, so orders His providences as to render it the subject of both inward and outward sorrow; and in such a degree and in such a manner that He will appear to it to have entirely withdrawn His favors. This is a very trying situation. It is impossible for the soul to live in it for any length of time without the experience of a very high degree of faith. The soul that can stand this test, that can drink the bitterness of this cup, especially when it is offered without any mitigating ingredient, cannot have anything less than an assured faith, a faith which fully purifies the heart and overcomes the world. He who has this confidence in God is necessarily the friend of God, according to the promise, and cannot be separate from Him either in the affections or the will. It is from that moment that the death of nature is experienced, which is nothing else than the cessation of all wrong and inordinate desires and purposes, and entire union with God in everything that He wills. Thus is the declaration of Scripture made true, Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.—Madame Guyon, quoted by Rev. Henry T. Cheever, *Correspondencies of Faith*, London, 1887, pp. 50, 51.

## LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE CREED. By HARVEY GOODWIN, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Honorary Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. London, John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1889. 8vo, pp. 408, 14s.

This book is intermediate between a scientific and a popular exposition of the Creed. It is intended neither for professed theologians nor for the uneducated. It has been written chiefly for intelligent and thoughtful persons of a higher range of general culture, who are supposed to have intellectual difficulties concerning the Christian faith. It does not attempt to explain the mysteries of our holy religion or to remove real difficulties which reason may encounter, but simply aims at defining the precise sphere which faith holds. In so doing it at once removes from the domain of faith much that perplexed inquirers or confused believers have earnestly struggled to know or apprehend. The classical work of Pearson on the Creed is constantly referred to, with the greatest reverence, and has, evidently, been a general model to the author. But he contends that, with the lapse of centuries, there must be an adaptation of methods to the changing circumstances, and that weapons, most admirably suited for one age, must be supplanted by those which have to meet new phases of error. Nor is it enough to warn the reader of errorists outside of the Church; he must be protected against the difficulties which arise in his own heart. The Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal confession, is regarded as containing all that should be required for the Christian profession, however important that the acceptance of many doctrines outside of it should be demanded of those who are commissioned to preach the Gospel to others, or that they should even be frequently preached in the pulpit. Such are the doctrines which Bishop Goodwin explicitly enumerates—viz.: "The Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation;" "Original or Birth Sin;" "The Justification of Man, Predestination and Election;" "The Authority of the Church." The sacraments can scarcely be added to this list, from the fact that when the catechumen comes to baptism, the very act shows the importance of this sacrament, while "with regard to the other great sacrament, it may be suggested that it would be time enough to express faith concerning it when the ap-

proach to the Lord's Table should make the question a practical one." The Incarnation is taken as not only the central, but the most fundamental article, and the other articles are viewed in its light. While some regard it "as the crowning truth, toward which the soul must laboriously climb by the help of evidences, of Scripture proof, of the doctrine of inspiration," etc., he prefers to "begin with the Incarnation and to work downward," and, with this assumption, finds all the elements of Christian belief falling into their places, and the whole becoming "consistent and satisfying to the human soul." Thus, in physical science, the treatment usually begins not with the proof for, but with the assumption of the principle of universal gravitation.

This plan the author has very successfully developed into a solid, discriminating, and well-written, but by no means exhaustive—for he makes no such attempt—discussion of the several articles of the Creed. He gives great prominence to his endeavor to trace the three sources from which the articles are derived. At three places—viz., in the Table of Contents, at the head of each chapter, and in a special table on page 21, the three capitals, R, H and F, are employed to indicate these sources, as Reason, History, and Faith. It seems strange to find the source of an article of *faith* referred to as not faith, but reason. The objection, however, is chargeable more to the mode of statement than to what Bishop Goodwin means. This will be seen from his defence of the proposition that the words, "I believe in God" are to be ascribed to Reason. He justifies this by urging that there can be no revelation unless we first recognize a revealer, and that conviction of the existence of God must precede all confidence in what he offers for our faith. This conviction, however, comes ultimately by an exercise of reason, whereby we examine the foundations of such belief communicated to us by tradition. Hence he writes the letter R opposite the article. We, however, object that, after all, such process of reason does not yield faith, but only probability. We thereby may reach, according to the correct discrimination of the author, the *opinion* of, but not *belief in* a God. The remainder of the article he freely concedes to faith. The second article, "and in Jesus Christ, His only Son," is ascribed to History and Faith, and marked H. F. In the discussion which follows he inclines to the opinion that he might have added R., because the Incarnation is "a truth which the intelligence of man may be prepared to wel-

come as reasonable and probable on general grounds." "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried," is referred exclusively to History. But the limitation is made, that "it needs the element of faith to transform dry facts into something capable of supporting spiritual life." Yet is it not the real meaning of the article, that the *Son of God* suffered and was crucified, dead and buried? And what other province but that of faith do we have here? That Jesus suffered and died is a matter of history; that this Jesus who suffered and died is God's only Son is a matter of faith. So throughout the other articles, reason and history seem to us to be raised to too high a position as co-ordinates of faith, instead of simply giving the basis from which faith ascends.

A distinction is made between shades of belief "from the otiose acceptance of a proposition" "to the apprehension of truth with the tenacity of a life and death struggle." The error of those who imagine that the belief professed by a Christian is that of mathematical certainty is exposed. In a certain sense, we are told that the term "agnostic" belongs to the vocabulary of Christianity rather than of scepticism, as it implies the need of faith as contrasted with complete and absolute knowledge. Bishop Goodwin applies the term *apistic* to those who desire to be known as *agnostics*. There is an interesting excursus concerning the possibility and necessity of certainty concerning matters of religious belief. The author argues that this cannot be attained by any process of reasoning, or as the result of a mere inward feeling, or by resort to Papal Infallibility, or by any Infallibility of the Church in its corporate capacity, or even by Scriptural Infallibility. "The infallibility of the Book [*i. e.*, of the Holy Scriptures] cannot be proved by anything within the book," but the proof must come from without. He finds the only means of assurance in "the religious faculty," called into activity "when Divine truth is put before the soul," and "more or less developed in different individuals according to their gifts" (Luke 10 : 21 ; 1 Cor. 2 : 14, 15).

An earnest plea is made for the exercise of forbearance in controversies with unbelievers, since "unbelief has different causes, different degrees, and even different meanings. It may mean the craving of a logical intellect for clearer proof than it can find ; it may mean a revolt from really untenable views of the Divine nature ; it may mean mere laziness and indifference to solemn subjects, and it may mean rebellion

against moral law." There is no attempt made to enter upon the theistic argument. Its conclusion is assumed, and only the one argument from cause adverted to. The success of Mohammedanism, at its first proclamation, is referred to the fact that it republished the dogma of the Unity of God after the Christian Church had permitted it to fall into obscurity. Too much, we believe, is asserted when the self-limitation of God's Omnipotence is discussed. The possibility of a self-limitation may be admitted. Even its occurrence may be proved. But when we are taught that in the material creation "the laws of geometry must be observed," and "the relations of space are independent of all choice or volition," and that "the Almighty will is limited by those laws," we are unable to follow the author. For what are the laws of geometry but the expression of the Divine will in the ordinary relations of nature? What, then, is to hinder the Framers of Nature from varying from His own order when He so wills? The bishop's argument would lead to a denial of the doctrine of Omnipotence. In accommodating himself to the weakness of those who have difficulties, he encounters other difficulties that are still more serious.

It requires only a reference to a concordance to show that a slip is made when we read that, while before our Lord's departure His disciples usually and familiarly called him Jesus, since then, "none of His most notable disciples have either wished or apparently dared to use" the name, except in connection with His official names, Christ and Lord, or as Son of God. See Acts 2 : 22 ; 4 : 2, 13 ; 5 : 30, 40 ; 6 : 14 ; 7 : 55 ; 8 : 35 ; 9 : 27 ; 10 : 38 ; 13 : 33 ; 17 : 3, 18 ; 26 : 9 ; Rom. 3 : 26 ; 8 : 11 ; 1 Cor. 12 : 3 ; 2 Cor. 4 : 5, 11 ; 11 : 4 ; Eph. 4 : 21, etc. Very interesting and far more correct is the statement that, in the Gospels, the name "Jesus Christ" occurs only thrice—viz., in Matt. 1 : 1 ; Mark 1 : 1, and John 17 : 3. John 1 : 17 has been overlooked. These are only slight blemishes in a very eloquent and forceful discussion of the historical significance of our Lord, as over against the advocates of the mythical theory. So, when discussing the extended description of the Sonship of our Lord, found in the Nicene Creed, the suggestion is made that the representatives of the Church at Nice must have been specially inspired, in order to devise such a precise definition in language so magnificent. And yet of the twenty-four words which it comprises sixteen belong to the older creed of



Eusebius, while five were not adopted at Nice, but were added to its creed at Constantinople in 381! The words "of God" in the clause "Son of God," and "very God of very God," are all that are original with the Council of Nice. This digression to the Nicene Creed leads the author to the statement that the Apostles' Creed is the Baptismal Confession, while the Nicene Creed is for those who are to partake of the Lord's Supper. The consideration of this article concludes with an excellent discussion of Gibbon's hypotheses for the rapid propagation of the Christian religion, in which the causes suggested are regarded as auxiliary or secondary causes, utterly inexplicable without a motive power back of them, and this power is found in the person and character of Jesus Christ.

On the third article there is a long discussion of the account of the conception in Luke, and the reasons for silence concerning it in the other Evangelists (except the brief account in Matthew), and in the Apostolic Epistles. This subject brings in also the possibility of the miraculous and the consideration of the uniformity of nature. Phil. 2 : 5-8 is interpreted several times in the book as though it were the Divine nature that was involved in the humiliation. The treatment of the article of the suffering of Christ appeals to the heart as well as the intellect. It shows much spiritual depth and fervor, and suggests that Bishop Goodwin is experienced and skilful in the care of souls. It would have been most natural, he tells us, for the Creed to have stated, after the birth of Christ, what He *did* on earth; but instead it tells us only that He *suffered*. The acceptance of a suffering Messiah was necessary to become a Christian. What Christ did and taught could be readily learned after admission to the company of believers by baptism. After an examination of how far the doctrine of a suffering Messiah entered into Old Testament prophecy, and was mingled with the expectations of the chosen people, there is an eloquent conclusion concerning the need of such a Saviour. The world is a suffering world, and a suffering Head is in sympathy with it. A mere teacher, a mere exemplar, could never regenerate the world; for many have neither the wish nor power to follow teaching or example. From the different view of the Cross, before and since the Crucifixion, an argument for the Divine origin of Christianity is derived. The consideration here of the Old Testament doctrine of the Cross introduces a question of Old Testament interpretation, which is, we believe, correctly

stated—viz., that many passages of the Old Testament, while not directly or explicitly teaching a New Testament doctrine, may be found to have such bearing when the doctrine itself is learned in its proper seat. The marvellously dispassionate tone of the records of Christ's death is forcibly shown. Bishop Goodwin has no sympathy with the moral theory of Christ's suffering, but defends its sacrificial and vicarious character. The manner in which Christ foretold His death is considered as a mark of His superhuman character, a contrast being made with the discourses of Socrates in prospect of death. "The Lord regarded His death not in relation to Himself, but in relation to His disciples; not as a condition of rest, but as the beginning of His real activity; not as death, in fact, at all, but as life."

In the article of the *Descensus* he classifies and rejects a number of views. It was not a mere virtual descent by transmitting the effects of His passion into regions where lost souls are in keeping. Nor is it that He Himself suffered in Hell; for the chief pain of Hell is separation from God, and remorse—impossible in the case of the Eternal Son. Nor is it a mere statement of burial, which would be tautology. But it was an act by which He asserted His perfect and continued manhood. The Resurrection is shown to be potentially involved in the idea of the Incarnation. It was in accord with our Lord's predictions and contrary to the expectations of His disciples. Improbable as it might seem, the world soon accepted it as a fact. It produced a great change in the general tone of educated thought with respect to human life. The reason why there are not more and fuller accounts of the Ascension is ascribed to the fact that it is a necessary sequel to the Resurrection. It was not something to be argued about, but "the very foundation upon which their lives were built." Modern critics forget that the Evangelists never attempted to write complete biographies of their Lord. Hence there are other omissions, as, for instance, that of the Lord's Supper, by St. John, that are just as significant. The Session at the Right Hand is interpreted as a figurative description of the completion of Redemption, Christ's continued office and work for humanity, and His Eternal Manhood. There is in the language a necessary anthropomorphism. The discussion of the Final Judgment introduces the proof for conscience and a Moral Governor. Eliminating all anthropomorphism, it is made synonymous with "the regeneration—the rec-

tification of all that is amiss, the complete establishment of the Kingdom of a perfectly righteous God and King." The anticipation of such judgment or regeneration is shown to be almost demanded by the instincts of man. The relation of space and time to God, and the relation of the Gospel of St. John to the Synoptics are also treated in this connection. The Judgment is regarded as not the end of all things, but only as introductory to the new order that is to prevail.

The doctrine of the Holy Ghost is traced, as taught by Christ, almost exclusively in St. John. The Gospels are the history of the ministry of the Son; the Acts the history of the ministry of the Spirit. This leads to a discussion of the Trinity, and the sometimes quoted heathen testimonies for it, especially those of Plato and Seneca. The opinion of Cudworth concerning the former is antagonized; that of Bishop Lightfoot concerning the latter is accepted with some modifications. On the article of the Church, Bishop Goodwin has erred in his grammatical construction of the words. We do not profess belief in the Holy Catholic Church, as we do in each person of the Trinity. In the original the words "Holy Catholic Church," "Forgiveness of sins," "Resurrection of the body," etc., are subject accusatives to an infinitive that is understood. "I believe that there is a Holy Catholic Church, forgiveness of sins," etc. There is a slip of another kind, unconsciously betraying a theory of church organization, when he refers to the Apostles "as a recognized nobility, an aristocracy by themselves!" The Church is defined as "the society which the Apostles formed around them, in accordance with the directions which they had received of their Master." The Apostolic work was not principally that of preaching, but that of planting new branches of the Church. The Communion of Saints is taken as the definition of the Church. "When we regard the world, not as we should wish it to be, but as it is, we may fairly make a division between those who call Jesus Lord, and those who do not; this is a clear and distinct line of division; and for certain good and intelligible purposes, those who are on the one side of the line may be said to constitute 'the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints,' and those who are on the other side, not to constitute any part of that Church." This concession he believes not inconsistent with answering in the negative the questions, "Is, then, one church no better than another? Is it a matter of indifference

whether in England a man is in communion with the ancient historical Church of the land?" The *Te Deum* is shown to bring out in clearest form the conception of the Church, as the Communion of Saints, while the idea of the article in all its fulness is made, "that this society has an undying life, that it has superhuman principles, that it is animated by the Holy Ghost, that it must spread and conquer the earth, that it is bound by spiritual ties to an unseen living society which is in the immediate presence of God."

We cannot appreciate the author's criticism of the translation of 1 John 3:4 in the Revised Version. "Sin is lawlessness" is preferable to "sin is the transgression of the law," not for the sole reason that thus one word in English corresponds to one in Greek. The meaning is different. A "transgression" is a positive act, while sin is deeper and more comprehensive than mere "transgression." As the Law is what God has commanded us to be, to do, and to omit doing, sin is the want of conformity with the Law, in state, habit, or disposition, as well as by overt act, or failure to act. It is a beautiful view of Holy Scripture that is here presented, when it is said that what gives unity to the Bible, which is not properly one, but many books, is that the subject-matter of all these books is sin and its forgiveness. "The Bible is the book of the forgiveness of sins." All, however, that the Bible, in all its breadth and depth, has taught concerning the forgiveness of sins, we are here correctly taught, is set forth, epitomized, and concentrated in the service of the Holy Communion.

When a contrast is made between the words of the Apostles' Creed, "the resurrection of the body," and the language of the office of Holy Baptism, "Dost thou believe in the resurrection of the *flesh*?" the venerable bishop has forgotten that the original of the Creed reads: *Resurrectionem carnis, Σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν*. The discussion of the resurrection does not seem to us as satisfactory as the most of the chapters in the book. A contrast is made between the Christian doctrine and that, first, of the Egyptians, and then of the Old Testament. The material identity of the resurrection body with that of the present life is denied, with a reference to Matt. 22:29, 30, and 1 Cor. 15:35-38, as proofs. To resort, as a substitute, to the doctrine of the identity of pre-resurrection and post-resurrection personality seems to be a begging of the question.

The treatment of the final article of

"Eternal Life" dwells upon the identity of the "eternal" and "everlasting;" rises from the consideration of life, even in its lowest forms, to that described in Is. 6: 1-3; Rev. 4: 2-8; grows eloquent in developing a thought of Maurice concerning John 17: 3, that the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ does not procure, but constitutes eternal life, and explains the omission of any allusion to eternal death in the Creed, by the fact, first, that it is implied in the article concerning the Judgment, and, secondly, that the Creed does not "profess to contain all things which it is right and well that Christians should believe." Eternal life is regarded as the culmination of the Incarnation of the Son of God.

The concluding chapter points to the importance of the English-speaking population in the present state of the world, their dominant influence, and the source of this influence as largely dependent upon the faith which their ancestors at the time of the Reformation professed and maintained. Several of the substitutes proposed for Christianity are successively examined at some length, such as the "Religion of Humanity" as taught by John Stuart Mill, and that of a "Reformed Christianity, adapted to an enlightened age." These are found to have nothing to commend them to the acceptance of the influential races of the world. The Creed has not lost its hold upon the heart and mind of the country, for which interesting statistical proofs are given. As the English language, therefore, must be a principal factor in the world's history, and wherever the English language establishes itself the name of Christ will be proclaimed, and the worship of God established upon the basis of the Apostles' Creed, Bishop Goodwin claims that there is a great future before the English Church, and that, without intending to disparage other agencies, "the most important part has been assigned to that ancient portion of the Church which we describe as the Church of England."

The survey thus made will satisfy our readers that the work, while by no means what the Germans would call "epoch-making," and at places betraying a lack of critical acumen, is one of more than ordinary merit. It is so full of solid argument, and suggestions, derived, evidently, from a wide range of reading, that, while its style is attractive, it should be read slowly and with ample time for thoughtful meditation upon what it offers. A minister or intelligent layman who reads through it once, will

generally endeavor to review its argument throughout a second time. It is a book whose interest grows upon the student as he proceeds.

H. E. JACOBS.

PHILADELPHIA.

PALESTINE IN THE TIME OF CHRIST. By EDMOND STAFFER, D.D., Professor in the Protestant Theological Faculty of Paris. Translated by Annie Harwood Holmden. Third Edition, with Map and Plans. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son [1890]. Pp. xii., 527; post 8vo, \$2.50.

This is the third edition of an excellent work. And this third edition adds greatly to the excellence of the work. For while the second edition was simply a reproduction of the first, this third edition has been subjected to and shows the results of a careful revision. What comes to us as thus revised is one of the best authorities we now have on the Palestine of Christ.

In the Preface to this third edition the author, after acknowledging the friendly criticisms and cordial reception accorded to the former editions of his work, differs from some of his critics in two particulars. The first has reference to the closing chapter of the volume on the Person and Teachings of Jesus; according to the author, necessary to the completeness of the book; according to others, not strictly belonging to the work, and in itself incomplete. The author indicates the real difficulty in the fact that the chapter is largely intended to serve as a point of departure between this present work and a forthcoming work on the person and preaching of Christ. Should, then, the chapter in question constitute an appendix to the present work or an introduction to the coming one? Under the circumstances, perhaps it would be better that it constitute neither; for while in the main the statements made in the chapter must meet with approval, still there are others about which there would be hesitation as to their acceptance, as, *e.g.*, that regarding the slow development in Christ as to His spiritual conception of the Messiahship. However, we are anxious to possess ourselves of the scholarly results of the author's forthcoming work, and of which this present work gives admirable promise.

The other point of difference between the author and some of his critics is in regard to the admission of Philo among the authorities to be consulted upon the subject treated in the present work. The author gives good reason for his non-admission of

Philo as an authority. Still we believe that the evil effect of the Alexandrine Philosophy was at that time, as well as later, far more prevalent than is generally supposed.

The author divides his work into two principal parts: *The Social Life* and *The Religious Life*. The treatment under these two heads is thorough, complete. It shows large research, excellent judgment, high scholarship. It is, in short, the work of a master hand.

The authorities consulted are good. The Scripture passages cited in proof or illustration are ample and for the most part accurate. In some instances, however, the author has seemed to put too much dependence upon versions as distinguished from the original text. Note may also be taken of a few other places where some minor corrections might be made. "The circle of the earth" in Isa. 40 : 22 was a circular *globe*, not circular *plane*, according to the author. This is substantiated by Job. On the same page (248) we cannot agree with the definition given of *Rakia*, translated "firmament." And in general as to science, we believe the Jew and other Semitic nations had far more cosmical and astronomical knowledge than that with which they are generally credited. We must differ from the author as to the lilies of the field being the red anemones (p. 220). A mistranslation makes *aloes* to be included among the perfumes. There is also a mistranslation of Cant. 1 : 10, as they did not wear the bands mentioned to keep up the hair (p. 194). Another mistranslation occurs as to the same Book (Cant. 8 : 6), for the signet, as a ring, was not worn suspended round the neck (p. 199). Instead of *Al Kenna* (p. 196), it should read *Al Henna*. Dinner, or the principal meal, is not always taken at mid-day, but more frequently in the evening (p. 183). It is an old mistake that people lie on couches during the meal. In some of the countries mentioned on p. 254 leprosy is not becoming more rare, but increasing. The Arab does not so revere the serpent (p. 228) or so ill-treat the dog (p. 224). The *Tan* in Job 30 : 29 can by no possibility be rendered "jackal" (p. 227). We are at a loss to know how the author can say, "We can understand the hesitation (as to admission) that may have been felt about Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs. They had neither religious nor moral worth to recommend them" (p. 364). These are minor inaccuracies. As a whole, the work is of the greatest value and highest authority. As to the subject treated, and both as to com-

prehensiveness of grasp and faithfulness in treatment, no other one work can equal it.

J. G. LANSING.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

SEVEN YEARS IN CEYLON. Stories of mission life. By MARY and MARGARET W. LEITCH, missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M. With portraits and many illustrations. London : S. W. Partridge & Co., 9 Paternoster Row [1890]. Sq. 8vo, vi., 170. 2s. 6d.

On taking up this book one is much struck by its pictured cover; and on opening it the many handsome illustrations strengthen the favorable first impression. There is a helpful map of Southern and Western India on page 4. As a picture-book it is a success. The letter-press is for the first 89 pp. a reproduction of letters to friends, written, of course, hastily and full of detail, but giving an inside view of mission work. From page 90 to page 128 is miscellaneous matter, such as sketches of pupils, and of the work of Miss Eliza Agnew, whose forty years' service has been so remarkable. From page 129 to the end is a plea for the Jaffna College, to complete whose endowment of £30,000 (£17,000 has been secured) the Leitch sisters have given themselves, and for the Medical Agency. This is the valuable part of the book. The numerous illustrations throughout are independent of the letter-press. Praise should be given to them, and if the authors had recast their book so as to bring them in they would have imparted more instruction.

Their present chief interest, however, is manifestly in the Jaffna College. Of it they say: "The Jaffna College, situated at Batticotta, in North Ceylon, is, as far as we know, the first attempt of a Christian community in a heathen land to establish a college of their own" (p. 129). It originated in a spontaneous effort, made by the native Christians of Jaffna in 1867, and £1700 was raised in Ceylon; £6000 was contributed in America, and the American Board gave land and buildings worth £5000. In 1872 the college was opened. While not denominational it is thoroughly Christian. Its directors are the senior missionaries of the three missions working in Jaffna—namely, the Church of England, the Wesleyan, and the A. B. C. F. M.—the British Government agent of the Northern Province, and representative native Christian gentlemen of the community. The Rev. S. W. Howland, of the Class of 1873 of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, is now president. In the preparatory



school are 167, in the college about 100 students. While a profession of Christianity is not a prerequisite to admission nor a condition of continued instruction, it is to be expected that the strong Christian influences will issue in conversion. Such has been the case. "Of the 326 who have entered its doors, 142 have gone out into the world as professed Christians and communicants; others have professed Christ after leaving the college, and the majority of the nearly 100 students at present in the college are Christians. Many of the graduates of the institution have become pastors, catechists, and teachers, not only in missions in Ceylon, but also in India" (pp. 131-32). The cost of educating a student in the Jaffna College, including food, clothing, books, incidentals, and tuition, does not exceed £10 a year. "The graduates are willing to become pastors, catechists, and evangelists on small salaries, supplied entirely by native churches. Of the 22 native churches in Jaffna, the majority are self-supporting" (p. 141).

The last chapter in the book deals with the proposed Medical Missionary Agency, both for men and women. A country in which "the water in which the feet of a fakir are washed is given to the sick to be drunk as a medicine" (p. 159) is surely in great need of medical relief. One hundred pounds will endow a bed in the hospital.

The causes thus brought to notice in this book merit liberal support. Money may be sent to the Misses M. and M. W. Leitch, care of S. Stanton, Esq., 17 Southampton Row, London, W. C.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

NEW YORK CITY.

#### MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

**Achelis, E. Chr., Prof. Dr.** Praktische Theologie. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr. Pp. xvi., 549, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Allard, Paul.** La Persécution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'Eglise. Paris: Lecoffre, 1890. 2 vols. Pp. xlviii., 456, 433, 8vo, 12 fr.

**Andrews, W.** Curiousities of the Church. Studies of Curious Customs, Services, and Records. London: Methuen. Pp. 136, 8vo, 6s.

**Appeal to Unitarians, An.** Being a Record of Religious Experiences. By a Convert from Unitarianism. New York: Longmans, 1890. Pp. 91, 16mo, \$1.

**Archinard, E.** Étude d'histoire et d'archéologie. Israël et ses voisins asiatiques, la Phénice, l'Arabie, et l'Assyrie de l'époque de Salomon à celle de Sanchérib. Avec 2 cartes. Genève. 8vo, 8 fr.

**Atsberger, Leonh., Prof. Dr.** Die christliche Eschatologie in den Studien ihrer Offenbarung im Alten und Neuen Testamente. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der jüdischen Eschatologie im Zeltalter Christi. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder. Pp. xv., 383, 8vo, 5 mk.

**Auvray, Lucien.** Les Registres de Grégoire IX. Recueil des bulles de ce pape, publiées ou analysées d'après les manuscrits originaux du Vatican. 1er fascicule. Feuilles 1-16. Paris: Thorin. Pp. 123, 4to, 9,00 fr.

**Barrou, L.** La Raison et la Foi, solution des deux grands problèmes qui ont pour but de concilier la raison avec la religion et la raison avec la foi. Laguy: Collin. Pp. 48, 8vo.

**Baumann, Prof. Dr.** Geschichte der Philosophie nach Ideengehalt und Beweisen. Gotha: Perthes, 1890. Pp. iv., 383, 8vo, 7 mk.

**Baumgarten, Von F.** Wie Wertheim evangelisch wurde. (Schriften für das deutsche Volk, herausgegeben vom Verein für Reformationsgeschichte. Nr. VIII.) Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. 66, 8vo, 15 pf.

**Baumgartner, A. J.** Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes. Thèse. Leipzig: Fock, 1890. Pp. 284, 8vo, 8 mk.

**Behre, Chrn., Dr.** Spiritisten, Occultisten, Mystiker, und Theosophen. Offenes Sendschreiben an den Verfasser der "Spaziergänge in's Reich der Mystik." Leipzig: Bauert. Pp. 85, 8vo, 1,50 mk.

**Bellesheim, A.** Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland von der Einführung des Christenthums bis auf die Gegenwart. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1890. Pp. xxxii., 701. 1 Karte. 8vo, 15 mk.

**Belorgey, J. J. M.** De originali peccato, dissertatio dogmatica. Lyon: Vitte, 1890. Pp. 411, 8vo.

**Bösch, J. M.** Friedrich Albert Lange und sein "Standpunkt des Ideals." Frauenfeld: Huber, 1890. Pp. 94, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Bötticher, G.** Die Erfüllung der alttestamentlichen Weissagung in Christo als Gesichtspunkt für die Behandlung des Matthäusevangeliums auf der Oberstufe. Berlin: Gaertner, 1890. Pp. 23, 4to, 1 mk.

**Bremond d'Ars, Guy de.** La Vertu morale et sociale du Christianisme. Paris: Perrin. 12mo, 13mo, 8vo.

**Brookes, J. H. D.D.** Mystery of Suffering. Chicago: Gospel Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. ii., 167, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

**Buchan, A. W.** An Evangel of Hope; or, Readings on the Spirit. (Short . . . Addresses: Thoughts on God, on Man, on Sin, on Salvation). London: Digby. Pp. 254, 8vo, 4s. 6d.

**Butler, J. Glentworth, D.D.** The Fourfold Gospel. The Four Gospels, consolidated without alteration in a continuous narrative, presenting the Life of Christ in order of its events. The text arranged in sections, taken from "The Bible Work." New York: Funk. Pp. 209, 12mo, 75 cts.

**Caldwell, Samuel Lant, D.D., LL.D.** Cities of our Faith, and Other Discourses. With a Biographical Sketch of Dr. Caldwell, by Oakman S. Stearns, D.D. Boston and New York: Houghton. Pp. 422, 8vo, \$2.

**Cannegieter, T.** De Godsdiens met plichtbesef en de geloofswaardigheden uit dichteende verbeelding geboren. Bedenkingen tegen Dr. L. W. E. Rauwenhoff's wijzegeerte van den godsdiensdienst. Leiden: Brill, 1890. Pp. iv., 284, 8vo, 2,25 f.

**Cave, A.** The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement. New edition, revised throughout and partly rewritten. Edinburgh: Clark. Pp. 545, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

**Cellarier, F.** Rapports du relatif et de l'absolu. Paris: Alcan, 1890. Pp. vi., 415, 4 fr.

**Child, Gilbert W.** Church and State under the Tudors. New York: Longmans, 1890. 8vo, cloth, \$5.

**Cornelius, C. A.** Gedachtnissrede auf J. v. Dollinger, gehalten in der Akademie der Wissenschaft am 28 März, 1890. München: Akademie. 4to, 1 mk.

**Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum ab academia inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum conditum atque digestum. 2e partie: inscriptions aramæiques continentes. Tome I. Fascic. I. avec atlas folio de 19 planches. Paris: Klincksieck. 4to, 50 fr.**

**Cracau, C.** Die Liturgie des heiligen Johannes Chrysostomus mit Uebersetzung und Kommentar. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. iv., 140, 8vo, 2,80 mk.

**Craig, James A.** Hebrew Word Manual, etymologically arranged. Cincinnati: Clarke, 1890. Pp. 130, cloth, \$1.

**Cramer, J.** De Brief van Paulus aan de Galatiërs in zijn oorspronkelijken vorm hersteld en verklaard. Utrecht: Breijer, 1890. Pp. viii., 16, 320, 8vo, 3,50 fl.

**Cutler, Julia Perkins.** Life and Times of Ephraim Cutler, Prepared from his Journals and Correspondence, by his Daughter; with Biographical Sketches of Jervis Cutler and William Parker Cutler. Cincinnati: Clarke, 1890. Pp. v., 333, 8vo, cloth, \$2,50.

**Dalton, Herm.** Die evangelische Kirche in Russland. 3 Vorträge. Leipzig: Duncker. 8vo, 2,80 mk.

**Dalton, Herm.** Religious Liberty in Russia. Open Letter to the Head of the Russian Synod, Privy Councillor Const. Pobiedonosieff. Leipzig: Duncker. 8vo, 2 mk.

**Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte.** See Hardy, E., and Krauss, F. S.

**Davids, T. W. Rhys.** *The Questions of King Milanda.* Translated from the Pali. (Sacred Books of the East, vol. 35.) New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xlix., 320, 8vo, cloth, \$2.75.

**Day, Bishop of Cashel.** *The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion Explained and Established.* Dublin: Hodges. Pp. 316, 8vo, 5s.

**Denkschrift** über die von 1887-1889 abgehaltene General-Visitation der Hermannsburg Mission in Süd-Afrika. Hermannsburg: Missionshandlung, 1890. Pp. vi., 224, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Doumergue, E.** *Essai sur l'histoire du culte réformé principalement au XVIIe et au XIXe siècle.* Paris: Fischbacher. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

**Dupanloup, Félix, Mgr., Bishop of Orleans.** *The Ministry of Preaching.* An Essay on Pastoral and Popular Oratory. Translated by Samuel J. Eales, M.A., D.C.L. Second edition, revised and enlarged. With Portrait. New York: Dutton. Pp. liv., 206, 16mo, \$1.50.

**Elmslie, W. G., Prof.** *Memor and Sermons.* Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll and A. N. Macnicoll. With Portrait. London: Hodder. Pp. 334, 8vo, 6s.

**Enseignement chrétien.** *Lectures choisies sur la mission divine de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ.* I. Jésus Christ dans l'histoire; II. Jésus Christ dans la société chrétienne; III. Jésus Christ dans les âmes fidèles. Paris: Lefort. Pp. viii., 456, 12mo.

**Fischer, Karl, Prof. Dr.** *Die Wiederkunft des Herrn, historisch-chronologisch und geschichtsphilosophisch betrachtet.* Vortrag, gehalten auf der Konferenz evangelischer Geistlichen und Gemeindeglieder zu Diez am 23 April, 1890. Herborn. Pp. 30, 8vo, 40 pf.

**Fouillée, Alfred.** *L'Evolutionnisme des idées-forces.* Paris: Alcan. Pp. xcvi., 303, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

**Frothingham, Octavius Brooks.** *Boston Unitarianism, 1830-1850.* A Study of the Life and Work of Nathaniel Langdon Frothingham. New York: Putnam, 1890. Pp. 272, 8vo, \$1.75.

**Geddes, Patrick, Prof., and Thompson, J. Arthur.** *The Evolution of Sex.* With Illustrations. New York: Scribner & Welford. Pp. vii., 322, 12mo, \$1.25.

**Glaser, Ed.** *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Propheten Muhammad, nebst einen Anhang zur Beleuchtung der Geschichte Abyssiniens im 8ten und 4ten Jahrhundert nach Christo.* Auf Grund der Inschriften, der Angaben der alten Autoren und der Bibel. 2. Bd. Berlin: Weidmann. Pp. 573, 8vo, 18 mk.

**Goitein, H.** *Der Optimismus und Pessimismus in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie.* Eine Studie über die Behandlung der Theodice in derselben bis auf Maimonides. Berlin: Mayer, 1890. Pp. viii., 111, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

**Gore, Charles, M.A.** *The Ministry of the Christian Church.* Second and Cheaper Edition. London: Rivington. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

**Grosse, E.** *Herbert Spencer's Lehre von dem Unerkennbaren.* Leipzig: Veit. 8vo, 3.30 mk.

**Hardy, E.** *Der Buddhismus, nach älteren Pali-Werken.* (Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte. Bd. I.) Münster: Aschendorff, 1890. Pp. viii., 168, mit 1 Karte, 8vo, 2.75 mk.

**Harnack, Ad.** *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* 3ter Bd. 1. und 2. Aufl. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. xxiv., 789, 8vo, 17 mk.

**Hartel, Wilhelm von.** *Patristische Studien.* 1-3. Zu Tertullian. Wien: Tempeky. Pp. 56, 64, 88, 8vo.

**Hauck, Alb.** *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands.* Auflösung der Reichskirche. 2 Thl. 1. und 2. Hälfte. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1890. Pp. iv., 757, 8vo, 14 mk.

**Hauréau, B.** *Des poèmes latins attribués à Saint Bernard.* Paris: Klincksieck, 1890. Pp. 102, 8vo.

**Haynes, Mary Storrs.** *The Crown of Life: from the Writings of Henry Ward Beecher.* With Introduction by Roseiter W. Raymond. Boston: Lothrop, 1890. Pp. xv., 346, 12mo, cloth, \$1.

**Heidenhain, A.** *Die Unionspolitik Landgraf Philippe von Hessen, 1557-1562.* Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. xix., 480, 139, 8vo, 16 mk.

**Heinrich, W.** *Gott und Materie. Betrachtungen zur Veröhnung von Religion und Wissenschaft.* Leipzig: Spohr (New York: Westermann). Pp. 57, 8vo, 45c.

**Henle, Frz. A.** *Der Epheserbrief des heiligen Apostels Paulus, erklärt.* Augsburg: Huttler. Pp. viii., 299, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Hensel, P.** *Ethisches Wissen und ethisches Handeln.* Ein Beitrag zur Methodenlehre der Ethik. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1889. Pp. iii., 48, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Herrick, G. F.** *An Intense Life: A Sketch of the Life and Work of Rev. Andrew T. Pratt, M.D., Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., in Turkey, 1852-72.* New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 96, 12mo, cloth, 50c.

**Hofmeister, G.** *Bernhard von Clairvaux.* 2ter Thl. Berlin: Gaertner, 1890. Pp. 28, 4to, 1 mk.

**Hoskier, Herman C.** *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604.* With two Fac-similes, together with ten Appendices. London: Nutt. Pp. 280, 8vo, 21s.

**How to Study the Bible.** By Dr. H. Drummond, Dr. Clifford, R. F. Horton, Rev. F. B. Meyer, and others. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 78, 12mo, cloth, 50 cts.

**Huot, C.** *La religion de Bab, réformateur persan du XIXe siècle.* Paris: Leroux, 1890. Pp. 68, 16mo.

**Hummel, Fridr.** *Die Bedeutung der Schrift von Carl Schwarz über das Wesen der Religion für die Zeit ihrer Entstehung und für die Gegenwart.* Ein Beitrag zur Behandlung des religionsphilosophischen Problems. Braunschweig: Schwetschke. Pp. xii., 175, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Humphrey, W.** *The One Mediator: or, Sacrifice and Sacraments.* London: Burns, 1890. 8vo, 5s.

**Ilkowiz, H.** *Rabbi. Jewish Dreams and Realities Contrasted with Islamic and Christian Claims.* Philadelphia: —, 1890. Pp. iii., 279, 8vo, cloth, \$2.

**James, C. C.** *The Gospel History of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in a Connected Narrative in the Words of the Revised Version.* New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xxvi., 188, 12mo, cloth, \$1.10.

**Jevons, W. Stanley.** *Pure Logic, and Other Minor Works.* Edited by Robert Adamson and Harriet A. Jevons. With a Preface by Prof. Adamson. New York: Macmillan, 1890. Pp. xxiii., 299, 8vo, cloth, \$2.50.

**Kauffmann, M.** *Fundamente der Erkenntnistheorie und Wissenschaftslehre.* Leipzig (New York: Westermann). Pp. 52, 8vo, 30 cts.

**Kierkegaard, S.** *Leben und Warten der Liebe.* Aus dem Dänisch übersetzt von A. Dörner. Leipzig: Richter, 1890. Pp. xv., 278, 241, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Killen, W. D.** *The Framework of the Church.* A Treatise on Church Government. Edinburgh: Clark. Pp. 350, 8vo, 9s.

**Klarer, J.** *Der Unfehlbare nach Johannes Schriften.* Leipzig: Richter, 1890. Pp. iii., 227, 8vo, 30 pf.

**Körner, Fr.** *Die Seele und ihre Thätigkeiten.* Nach den neuesten Forschungen auf Grund physiologischer Gesetze für Theologen, Pädagogen, Juristen und Gebildete dargestellt. Leipzig (New York: Westermann). Pp. 303, 8vo, \$1.35.

**Krauss, F. S.** *Volks Glaube und religiöser Brauch der Südslaven.* (Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nichtchristlichen Religionsgeschichte. Bd. II.) Münster: Aschendorff, 1890. Pp. xvi., 176, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Kühl, Ernst.** *Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Christi.* Biblisch-theologische Untersuchung. Berlin: Hertz, 1890. Pp. 230, 8vo, 4 mk.

**Kuenen.** *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des alten Testaments hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung.* Autorisierte deutsche Ausgabe von Th. Weber. Theil I. St. I. Leipzig: Reilsand. 8vo, 6 mk.

**Kuyper, A.** *Tractaat van den Sabbath.* Historische dogmatische Studie. Amsterdam: Wormser, 1890. Pp. 168, 8vo, 1.60 fr.

**La Bouère, Mme. la Comtesse de.** *Souvenirs de la Comtesse de la Bouère. La Guerre de la Vendée (1793-96).* Preface par le Marquis Costa de Beauregard. Paris: Plon. Pp. xvi., 368, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

**Lactantius, L. C. F.** *Opera omnia, accedunt carmina eius quo feruntur et L. Caelili qui inscriptus est de mortibus persecutorum über, recensuerunt S. Brandt et G. Laubmann.* Pars I. *Divinae institutiones et epitoma divinarum institutionum, recensuit S. Brandt.* (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, Vol. XIX.) Wien: Tempeky. Pp. cxviii., 761, 25 mk.

**Längin, G.** *Die biblischen Vorstellungen vom Teufel und ihr religiöser Werth.* Ein Beitrag zu der Frage: Gibt es ein Teufel? Ist der Teufel ein Gegenstand des christlichen Glaubens? Leipzig: Wigand, 1890. Pp. vi., 97, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

- Leitch, M. and M. W.** Seven Years in Ceylon. Stories of Mission Life. London: Partridge. 8vo, bds., 2s. 6d.
- Liebenam, W.** Zur Geschichte und Organization des römischen Vereinswesens. Leipzig: Teubner, 1890. 8vo, 10 mk.
- Lipperheide, V.** Thomas von Aquino und die platonische Ideenlehre. München: Rieger. Pp. iii, 131, 8vo, 3 mk.
- Loewe, J. H.** Die speculative Idee der Freiheit, ihre Widersacher, ihre praktische Verwertung. Prag: Rivaac. 8vo, 4 mk.
- Lorenz, Edmund S.** The People's Hymnal: for Use in Public and Social Worship. Dayton, O.: Shuey, 1890. Pp. 304, 55, 75 cts.
- McNeill, J.** Rev. Sermons. Vol. I. Introduction by Rev. G. T. Pierson, D.D. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1890. Pp. 416, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.
- Manzoni, Caesar.** De natura peccati deque ejus remissione disputatio. S. Angeli Laudensis. [Rome?] 1890. Pp. 431, 8vo, 4 mk.
- Mariano, Raff.** Buddismo e Cristianesimo: studio di religione comparata. Napoli, 1890. Pp. x, 97, 8vo.
- Marsh, R. L.** "Faith-Healing." A Defence; or, The Lord Thy Healer. New York: Revell, 1890. Pp. 147, 12mo, 75 cts.
- Massonius, M.** Ueber Kant's transcendente Aesthetik. Leipzig: Fock. 8vo, 2.40 mk.
- Matheson, A. S.** The Gospel and Modern Substitutes. London: Oliphant. Pp. 316, 8vo, 5s.
- Maybaum, S.** Jüdische Homiletik nebst einer Auswahl von Texten und Themen. Berlin: Dümmler, 1890. Pp. viii, 383, 8vo, 8.60 mk.
- Meredith, F.** Is Christ Divided? Sectarianism and Unification. London: Simpkin. Pp. 72, 8vo, 2s.
- Milloué, L. de.** Précis d'histoire des religions. Première partie: Religions de l'Inde. Paris: Leroux. Pp. viii, 339, 12mo, 3.50 fr.
- Moule, H. C. G., Rev.** Veni Creator: Thoughts on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit of Promise. London: Hodder. Pp. 296, 8vo, 5s.
- Murphy, J. G.** Sacrifice as Set Forth in Scripture. The Carey Lectures for 1888. London: Hodder, 1889. Pp. 252, 8vo, 5s.
- Parker, Joseph, D.D.** The People's Bible. Discourses upon the Holy Scripture. Vol. XII: The Psalter. New York: Funk. Pp. iv, 464, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.
- Parsons, Albert Ross.** Parsfal: The Finding of Christ through Art; or, Richard Wagner as Theologian. New York: Putnam's, 1890. Pp. iii, 113, 8vo, cloth, \$1.
- Pearson, S.** Thyself and Others. Six Chapters in Practical Christianity. London: Clarke. Pp. 126, 16mo, 1s.
- Pilloud, E.** Daniel et le rationalisme biblique. Thèse. Chambéry: Drivet, 1890. Pp. vii, 370, 8vo.
- Reischaus, Th., Dr.** Die Seele der Menschen. Eine gemeinliche Darstellung der menschlichen Seelenkräfte, wie sie sich in der Erfahrung des Lebens offenbaren. Hanau: Albrecht. Pp. viii, 108, 8vo, 1.30 mk.
- Ritschl, A.** Fides implicita. Eine Untersuchung über Köhlerglauben, Wissen und Glauben, Glauben und Kirche. Bonn: Marcus, 1890. Pp. v, 97, 8vo, 2 mk.
- Röhrich, R.** Kleine Studien zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge. Berlin: Gaertner, 1890. Pp. 28, 4to, 1 mk.
- Römer, H.** Die Indianer und ihr Freund David Zeisberger. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1890. Pp. 109, 8vo, gebunden, 1.50 mk.
- Rosenzweig, Ad.** Jerusalem und Cäsarea. Ein historisches Essay mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Bedeutung Cäsarea's für Judentum und Christenthum. Berlin: Mayer. 8vo, 60 pf.
- Sauvé, Mgr.** Le Pape (son autorité suprême, sa magistrature infallible) et le concile du Vatican. Paris: Berche. 6 fr.
- Schatble, K. H., Prof. Dr.** Die Juden in England vom 8. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart. Ein kulturgeschichtliche Bild. Karlsruhe: Braun. Pp. xi, 133, 8vo, 2 mk.
- Schall, J.** Ulrich von Hutten. Ein Lebensbild aus der Reformation. (Schriften für das deutsche Volk, herausgegeben vom Verein für Reformationsgeschichte. Nr. VII.) Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1890. Pp. 50, 8vo, 15 pf.
- Schmick, H.** Die Erde kein Abschluss! Vorträge und Gespräche über alle Entwicklung. Leipzig (New York: Westermanns). Pp. 167, 8vo, \$1.05.
- Schneider, C. M., Dr.** Das apostolische Jahrhundert, als Grundlage der Dogmengeschichte dargestellt. Bd. II. Abth. II. (Zusatzheft 2 zu "St. Thomasblätter" 3. Jahrgang.) Regensburg: Verlags-Anstalt. Pp. 29-416, 8vo, 2.40 mk.
- Schneider, J.** Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche des Elsass in der Zeit der französischen Revolution (1789-1802). Strassburg: Schmidt, 1890. Pp. vii, 212, 8vo, 3 mk.
- Schults, H.** Grundriss der evangelischen Dogmatik. Zum Gebrauche bei akademischen Vorlesungen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1890. Pp. vi, 109, 8vo, geb., 2.30 mk.
- Sigwart, Chrp., Dr.** Ein Collegium logicum im XVI. Jahrhundert. Mittheilungen aus einer Handschrift der Universitäts-Bibliothek in Tübingen. Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr. Pp. 42, 4to, 2 mk.
- Soden, H. von.** Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jacobus, Judas. (Handcommentar zum neuen Testament. Bearbeitet von H. J. Holtzmann. 3ter Bd. 2te Abth.) Freiburg i. Br.: Mohr, 1890. Pp. viii, 182, 8vo, 3 mk.
- Spiers, Wm., Rev.** The Sabbath Made for Man: an Inquiry into the Origin and History of the Sabbath Institution, with a Consideration of its Claims upon the Christian, the Church, and the Nation. London: Pp. 220, 8vo, 2s. 6d.
- Spitta, Frdr.** Christi Predigt an die Geister. (I Petri III. 19, ff.) Ein Beitrag zur Neutestamentlichen Theologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck. Pp. iii, 68, 8vo, 1.50 mk.
- Stricker, E.** Johannes Calvin als erster Pfarrer der Reformierten Gemeinde zu Strassburg. Nach urkundlichen Quellen. Strassburg i. E.: Heitz, 1890. Pp. vi, 66, 8vo, 1.30 mk.
- Thomson, W. D.** Revelation and the Bible. A Popular Exposition for the Times. London: Simpkin. Pp. 250, 8vo, 5s. 6d.
- Trede, Th.** Das Heidentum in der römischen Kirche. Bilder aus dem religiösen und stüben Leben Süditaliens. 2. Thl. Gotha: Perthes. Pp. iii, 397, 8vo, 5 mk.
- Tyler, B. B.** Peculiarities of the Disciples: a Series of Five Sermons. Cincinnati: Stand. Pub. Co., 1890. Pp. ii, 60, 12mo, paper, 25 cts.
- Underwood, Horace Grant, Rev., A.M.** An Introduction to the Korean Spoken Language. In two Parts: Part I. Grammatical Notes. Part II. English into Korean. Yokohama, Japan: Kelly & Walsh. (London: Trübner; New York: Randolph, 1890.) Pp. x, 425.
- Underwood, Horace Grant, Rev., A.M., assisted by Homer B. Hulbert, A.B., and James S. Gale, A.B.** A Concise Dictionary of the Korean Language in Two Parts. Korean-English and English-Korean. Student Edition. Yokohama, Japan: Kelly & Walsh. (London: Trübner; New York: Randolph, 1890.) Pp. x, 198, 29c.
- Urquhart, John.** What are we to Believe? or, the Testimony of Fulfilled Prophecy. New York and Chicago: Revell. Pp. viii, 231, 12mo, 75 cts.
- Varnbüler, Th. von.** Widerlegung der Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Berlin (New York: Westermann). Pp. 327, 8vo, \$3.85.
- Vernon, S. M., Rev., D.D.** Probation and Punishment: A Rational and Scriptural View of the Future State of the Wicked, with Special Reference to the Doctrine of a Second Probation. New York: Ketcham, 1890. Pp. ii, 300, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.
- Villeneuve, Henri de.** L'Esprit de Jésus, ou le christianisme rationaliste. 3 vols. Paris: Unsinger. Pp. xii, 229, 273, 18mo, 7 fr.
- Weill, Alexandre.** Le cinq Livres (mosaïstes) de Moïse. Traduits textuellement sur l'hébreu, avec commentaires et étymologies. (Premier livre: la Genèse, avec élimination des textes interpolés, preuves à l'appui de la religion miraculée et idolâtrée du second temple, textes qu' Ezra et la grande synagogue ont frauduleusement mis dans la bouche de Moïse.) Paris: Reiff. Pp. xvi, 224, 8vo, 5 fr.
- Weisbach, F. H.** Die achämeniden Inschriften zweiter Art. (Assyriologische Bibliothek, F. Delitzsch und P. Haupt. IX. Bd.) Leipzig: Hinrich, 1890. Pp. viii, 126, 4to. Mit 26 autographischen Tafeln, 30 mk.
- Wider Hope.** Essays and Strictures on the Doctrine and Literature of Future Punishment, by Numerous Writers, Lay and Clerical, including Archdeacon Farrar, Very Rev. E. H. Plumptre, Rev. Henry Allon, etc. With a Paper on the Supposed Scriptural Expression for Eternity, by Thomas de Quincey; and a Bibliographical Appendix of Recent Works on Eschatology as Contained in the British Museum. London: Unwin. Pp. 436, 8vo, 7s. 6d.
- Wilm, Egbert.** Religion und Wissenschaft. Ein Sühnversuch. Leipzig: Fock. Pp. 63, 8vo, 1 mk.
- Wits, Ch. Alph.** Der zweite Brief Petri. In homiletisch-exegetische Reden erklärt. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann. Pp. 94, 8vo, 1.30 mk.

**Wolf, G.** Der Augsburger Religionsfriede. Stuttgart: Götschen, 1890. Pp. xv., 171, 8vo, 4 mk.

**Wulf, J. E., Prof. Dr.** Sanct Willihad, Apostel der Sachsen und Friesen an der deutschen Nordseeküste und erster Bischof von Bremen. Breslau: Müller, 1890. Pp. x., xiv., 100, 8vo, 80 pf.

**Young, R.** The Success of Christian Missions: Testimonies to their Beneficent Results. London: Hodder. Pp. 270, 8vo, 5s.

**Zahn, Adf., Dr.** Das Deuteronomium. Eine Schutzschrift wider modernkritisches Unwesen. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann. Pp. viii., 122, 8vo, 1.60 mk.

## NOTICES OF MAGAZINES AND MINOR BOOKS.

**A COLLEGE OF COLLEGES**, led by D. L. Moody, and taught by Rev. I. D. Driver, Bishop C. D. Foss, D.D., Professor W. R. Harper, Rev. M. D. Hoge, D.D., Rt. Rev. M. E. Baldwin, Rev. A. J. Gordon, D.D., Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D., Mr. George C. Needham and others. Session of 1889. Edited by Fred L. Norton. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell [1890]. pp. 301, 12mo. Cloth, \$1, net.

Those who have not attended any of the sessions at Northfield scarcely understand the enthusiasm of those who have, when they recount their experiences and impressions. To such the reading of the volume before us will be a revelation. Not only the fact that there is scarcely a dull page in the whole book, but the intense interest of parts and the spirit that pervades the whole, give the book a character of its own. One can take it up for a few moments and get instruction or impulse, according to the page to which one opens, or one can read it from end to end with the liveliest interest and a growing understanding of what others may have reported and the cause of their enthusiasm.

A considerable part of the volume is taken up with an account of the work of the College Young Men's Christian Associations. One of the most interesting chapters deals with "The Student Missionary Uprising." Thirty-six pages are devoted to the work in Japan, and a letter from Mr. L. D. Wishard, the well-known College Secretary. The first hundred pages relate largely to the work among our college students, while the rest of the volume is taken up with addresses made at the convention of 1889. The names on the title page are a sufficient guarantee of the quality of the latter part, while the former will speak for itself.

Under the title, *Many Infallible Proofs*, F. H. Revell has issued a new edition of *The Evidences of Christianity; or, the Written and Living Word of God*, by Arthur T. Pierson, D. D. [pp. 317, paper, 35 cents; cloth, \$1]. The book consists of the following parts: Introductory chapter, "Weighing the Proofs," and two subdivisions or parts of the discussion—Part I. being divided into "The Prophetic Seal," "The Ruin of Jerusalem," "Miracles," "Scientific Accuracy of the Bible," "Scientific Truth of the Bible," "The Moral Beauty of the Bible," "The Moral Sublimity of God's Word." Part II. contains the following chapters: "Christ in the Old Testament," "The Person of Christ," "The Mystery of the God-Man," "Christ, the Teacher from God," "The Originality of Christ's Teaching," "The Power of Christ's Teaching." The author has indicated the scope and purpose of the book in a "Word Preliminary," in which he has indicated that he here gives others the benefit of the thoughts and proofs which have made clear to his own mind that in the Bible we have the Book of God, and in Christ the Son of God. The contents of the volume are already sufficiently indicated above, and it only remains to say that it is in the author's clear and straightforward style, which many of us have enjoyed in the pulpit.

Another book, or rather booklet, from the same publisher, is Rev. Dr. C. H. Parkhurst's sermon, *The Swiss Guide*, sq. 16mo, pp. 31, gilt top, rough edges. It is one of the sweetest and most inspiring of sermons, and deserves the dainty dress it has received. It will make an excellent gift for Christmas or other anniversary. The parallel between the traveller's relation to his guide and the soul's to its Saviour, is cleverly conceived and beautifully worked out. C. R. GILLET.

**HARPER'S** for August has an attractive table of contents. For one thing, there is the brief article of Francis Parkman's, which relates an unusual experience. Forty years ago he was for a few days an inmate of the convent of the Passionists at Rome. He was thus able to study the order from the inside. But he did not like the experience; in fact, says that he preferred his later life among the American savages to that among the Roman monks. Another article, which appeals to the religious reader, is on "Street Life in India," which is capably illustrated in an unconventional way. It is another evidence that India must be a very interesting country to visit. Edward Everett Hale, who has lately devoted himself to serious historical study, brings out one of the fruits of it in "The True Story of Magellan and the Pacific."

It has not been possible to give the story so fully till recently. Theodore Child's "Impressions of Berlin" is a lively article. It gives a good picture of the surface life of Berliners. Readers should be reminded that Mr. Child gives only the impressions of a tourist, who has no opportunity to study the people. The famous house of Plantin, at Antwerp, comes up for notice in Miss Octavia Hensel's article. All visitors to the same will remember that the house is now a museum, and one of the most attractive in Europe. The illustrations are good and well chosen. "Port Tarascon" is continued, and there are other articles of interest and value.

**THE CENTURY** for August has these articles: "The Treasures of the Yosemite" (by John Muir); "The Making of the Pearl" (by Mrs. Harriet Prescott Spofford); "Italian Old Masters" (by W. J. Stillman); "The Perils and Romance of Whaling" (by Gustav Kobbé); "The Emancipation of Joseph Peloubet" (by John Elliott Curran); "The Autobiography of Joseph Jefferson" (by The Forgotten Millions (by President Charles W. Eliot); "Poems" (by F. D. Sherman); "An Artist's Letters from Japan" (by John La Farge); "They Said" (by Miss Edith M. Thomas); "The Anglomaniacs, III." (by A. Provencal Pilgrimage, II." (by Mrs. Harriet W. Preston); "Marian Drurie" (by Bliss Carman); "The Women of the French Salons" (by Mrs. Amelia Gere Mason); "A Song of Growth" (by Charles G. D. Roberts); "A Yankee in Andersonville" (continued, by Dr. T. H. Mann); "Friend Olivia" (continued, by Mrs. Amelia Barr); "Guillelmus Rex" (a poem on Shakspeare, by Thomas Bailey Aldrich). These articles are followed by the three departments—*Topics of the Time*, *Open Letters*, and *Eric's Brief*. Of the articles thus enumerated, that of President Eliot may be first recommended to thoughtful readers. It is a study of the common American mode of life, as typified by the permanent native population of Mount Desert. It states and demonstrates that in that town \$250 a year suffices to support comfortably a family of 7 or 8 persons. Is it owing to our "protective" tariff that the men there are obliged to wear clothing made of cotton wool and not a little wool in it, and which soon gets shabby? Dr. Mann concludes his thrilling story of his Andersonville imprisonment.

**SCRIBNER'S** for August contains a welcome article from Mr. Edward Marston, the veteran London publisher, and one of the firm which publishes Stanley's latest volume, "How Stanley Wrote his Book," meaning the book referred to, "In Darkest Africa." It shows that Stanley kept elaborate data in the shape of pocket note-books, and also two volumes of calculations of astronomical observations, etc., and from these, while in darkest Africa, prepared the narrative which has now been given to the world. So the famous narrative was by no means so hastily gotten ready as the stories of Stanley's tremendous literary labors at Cairo would lead one to expect. On the contrary, ere he emerged to civilization—and it seems to marriage—he had carefully, though roughly, executed his great task. Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Blasfield give us a description of the "Paris of the Three Musketeers," that queer old Paris, with its narrow streets and dangerous lanes, which exists so near to and yet is so far from the Paris of Baron Hausmann. The same contrast may be found in New York. The majority of its inhabitants know nothing of the parts of the city like the "Bend." It is so with all great cities. They have their open secrets. The busy man has no time, even had he the inclination, to go where crime lurks and where misery lifts its horrid head. Such ignorance is really desirable. Mr. Thomas Bailey Aldrich, since he has left the editor's room of the *Atlantic*, has found time to pursue literature with greater freedom, and appears in the congenial garb of poet in *Scribner's* this month, as he does also in the *Century*.

**LITTLE, BROWN'S** for August has the following table of contents: "What Gold Cannot Buy" (a complete novel, by Mrs. Alexander); "Zantho—My Friend" (a poem, by Miss Elizabeth Stoddard); "Lawn Tennis for Women" (by the Misses Bertha L. Townsend and Margaret Lyman Ballard); "Veiled" (by Miss Margaret Vandegrift); "At the End of the Passage" (by the rising novelist, Mr. Rudyard Kipling, whose life in India is yielding him golden fruitage, and to whom the fact is a great temptation to write himself out while still in his early manhood); "Ebb and Flow" (by H. W. F.); "Contemporary Biography—Harriet Beecher Stone" (by Miss Eleanor P. Allen); "The Pale Cast of Thought" (by Mr. Owen Wister); "Woman" (a poem, by Mr. Charles H. Crandall); "The Lapse of Tolstol" (by Rev. Frederic M. Bird, the famous hymnologist, who takes Tolstol to task, in no gentle fashion, for his "Kreutzer Sonata," which, he says, "ought never to have been printed, nor written either. But for the eminent name it bears, it would hardly have found a publisher here in America or in England." Its only legitimate effects will be to disgust decent people and injure a great reputation." The illegitimate effect of which criticism will be to increase the sale of Tolstol's latest book. It is wiser to enter into a conspiracy of silence when a really bad book appears. Every one knows that the pulpit denunciation of "Robert Elmore" gave that novel a great sale); "Milk Legislation" (by Mr. R. M. Elfreth); "The Philadelphia Academy of Natural Science" (by Mr. Charles Morris). Then follow the three regular departments—*Book Talk*, *New Books*, and *With the Wits*.